CENTRAL LIBRARY

CENTRE OF ADVANCED STUDY IN ANCIENT INDIAN HISTORY AND CULTURE UNIVERSITY OF CALCUTTA

LECTURES AND SEMINARS

No. 1-B (SEMINARS)

CENTRAL LIBRARY

LAND SYSTEM
AND
FEUDALISM IN ANCIENT INDIA

Edited by

D. C. SIRCAR

Carmichael Professor and Head of the Department of Ancient Indian History and Culture, Calcutta University

CALCUTTA UNIVERSITY CENTRAL LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF CALCUTTA

1966

BCU 219

*FIRST PUBLISHED 1966

080 C.U.
030/7

252243

©

PRINTED IN INDIA
PUBLISHED BY SIBENDRANATH KANJILAL,
SUPERINTENDENT, CALCUTTA UNIVERSITY PRESS,
48, HAZRA ROAD, BALLYGUNGE, CALCUTTA.
AND
PRINTED BY SRI KALIDAS MUNSHI AT THE PCORAN PRESS,
21, BALARAM GHOSE STREET, CALCUTTA-4.

Price Rs. 7.50

CENTRAL LIBRARY

PREFACE

When the U.G.C. Centre of Advanced Study began to function as a part of the Department of Ancient Indian History and Culture at the University of Calcutta about the middle of 1964, it was proposed that the Centre would arrange for two courses of lectures per year and also seminars on allied topics along with the lectures. Prof. R. S. Sharma delivered the first course of lectures and also conducted seminars organised in that connection. Prof. Sharma's lectures were sent to the press in March 1965, by Prof. N. R. Ray, the then Director of the Centre.

It was in the first week of May, 1965, that I was advised by Prof. Ray to arrange for the publication of the Proceedings of the seminars conducted by Prof. Sharma along with the articles read by scholars participating therein.

The Proceedings have been drawn up on the basis of notes submitted by the Reporters to whom my thanks are due. I have tried to make them as accurate as possible. For any errors that might have crept into the reports on the discussions, I crave the indulgence of the scholars who participated in the seminars.

It is possibly necessary to point out that, of the ten articles presented in this volume, only two are contributed by the editor himself and that, only in respect of these two, he may be held responsible for errors of fact and judgment. The other papers have been printed without substantial change.

I am thankful to Sri Rabindra Kumar Bhattacharya for the preparation of the Index and to the Pooran Press for the help rendered in bringing out the work in a short period of time.

Centre of Advanced Study
in Ancient Indian History and Culture,
University of Calcutta.
January 22, 1966.

D. C. SIRCAR
Director

CONTENTS

Subject	*Page*
Part I—Land System	
PROCEEDINGS OF THE SEMINAR : First Day ...	3
1. D. C. Sircar (Calcutta University) : Land System ...	11
2. S. D. Singh (Lucknow University) : Royal Ownership of Land in the Vedic Period ...	23
3. P. N. Pattabhirama Sastri (Calcutta University) : Prācina-Bhārate Bhū-niyamāḥ (Land System in Ancient India)	32
Part II—Feudalism in Ancient India	
PROCEEDINGS OF THE SEMINAR : Second Day	41
1. S. K. Mitra (Sanskrit College, Calcutta, and Calcutta University) : Feudalism in Ancient India ...	51
2. D. C. Sircar (Calcutta University) : Landlordism confused with Feudalism	57
3. B. P. Mazumdar (Patna University) : Merchants and Landed Aristocracy in the Feudal Economy of Northern India (8th to 12th Century A.D.) ...	62
4. B. N. S. Yadava (Allahabad University) : Secular Land Grants of the Post-Gupta Period and Some Aspects of the Growth of Feudal Complex in Northern India	72
5. H. C. Neogi (Sanskrit College, Calcutta) : Origin of Feudalism in Ancient India	95
6. S. K. Maity (Jadavpur University) : Mediaeval European Feudalism and Manorialism *versus* Ancient Indian Landed Economy ...	100
7. B. D. Chatterjee (Burdwan University) : Aspects of Politico-Economic History of Ancient India ...	117
ADDENDUM	124
INDEX	127

CENTRAL LIBRARY

PART I

LAND SYSTEM

Proceedings of the Seminar

First Day

Date : 18th December, 1964.

Time : 10 A.M. to 1 P.M. and
3 P.M. to 5 P.M.

Subject : Land System

Place : Asutosh Hall, Calcutta University.

President : PROF. R. S. SHARMA, Patna University.

Principal Speaker : PROF. D. C. SIRCAR, Calcutta University.

Participants besides the President and the Principal Speaker :—

1.	DR. B. P. MAZUMDAR	Patna University
2.	DR. S. D. SINGH	Lucknow University
3.	DR. B. N. SINGH YADAVA	Allahabad University
4.	DR. LALLANJI GOPAL	Banaras Hindu University
5.	DR. H. V. S. MURTHY	Gauhati University
6.	PROF. S. B. CHAUDHURI	Burdwan University
7.	DR. S. K. MAITI	Jadavpur University
8.	PROF. N. R. RAY	Calcutta University
9.	PROF. S. K. SARASWATI	Victoria Memorial, Calcutta
10.	SRI D. MUKHERJI	Calcutta University
11.	DR. S. K. MITRA	Sanskrit College, Calcutta, and Calcutta University
12.	DR. H. N. CHATTERJEE	Sanskrit College, Calcutta, and Calcutta University
13.	SRI D. BISWAS	Presidency College, Calcutta, and Calcutta University
14.	SRI B. CHATTERJEE	Burdwan University
15.	DR. Miss R. NIYOGI	Bethune College, Calcutta

Reporters : SRI DIPAKCHANDRA BHATTACHARYYA and SRI MIHIRMOHAN MUKHOPADHYAY

Morning Session

The Seminar began at 10 A.M.

Prof. D. C. Sircar read his paper on 'Land System'. Prof. R. S. Sharma thanked Prof. Sircar for his paper and asked the house to raise points for discussion. Then followed some discussion on the ownership of land in ancient India.

Dr. S. K. Mitra observed that a clear-cut distinction between the state-land and the crown-land can hardly be made in the context of ancient India. Prof. S. K. Saraswati said that, as a whole, the land in Ancient India belonged to the State and so there grew up the theory of state ownership of land. Dr. B. P. Mazumdar observed that, right from the time of the Guptas, it is found that the land donations are made in the name of the king and that no distinction between the king's land and the state land is made. Dr. H. N. Chatterjee referred to some passages in the Smṛti texts regarding the loss of proprietary right on land. Prof. Sircar observed that theoretically all land in ancient India belonged to the state, but that there is evidence to show that some land was attached to the king as his personal *jāgīr* which seems to be called, e. g., *rājakaṁ kṣetram = asmat-svatvakam* in a Nasik inscription and *rāja-sambhoga* in the Manahali plate.

Prof. S. B. Chaudhuri raised the following questions : (1) whether, by making the religious endowments, the king acquired religious merit for himself or for the State, (2) whether Kauṭilya refers to the state land or to the crown land and (3) whether any distinction is made between the state land and the king's land while making grants of land. Prof. Sircar observed that, according to epigraphic records, the religious merit accruing to grants of land was claimed by the king for himself and sometimes also for his parents and that Kauṭilya does not seem to distinguish between the state land and the king's *jāgīr*.

Sri D. Mukherji said that, in ancient Rome, the land belonged to the king and the aristocrats enjoyed a portion

of it by paying a nominal rent to the king and that practically there was no land for the ordinary peasants. He wanted to know whether conditions concerning the ownership of land in ancient India were similar to those of Rome.

Prof. Sharma said that land in ancient India was more or less the personal property of the king and that there is no evidence to show that the whole land belonged to the State. He referred to the inscriptions of Western India, which use terms like *svabhoga* and *sambhoga*, alluding, according to him, to the crown land. Prof. Sircar disagreed with this view and pointed to the reference to *svabhoga-nagara* in the Eran inscription of Samudragupta.

Prof. N. R. Ray said that, in ancient India, the king earned the ownership of land from his ancestors, so that it is possible, in his opinion, to speak of royal land or crown land and not of state land because the concept of state, as it is understood in the European context, was unknown in ancient India. Prof. Sircar disagreed with this view also and pointed out that two of the seven constituents of sovereignty are separately mentioned as *svāmin* (king) and *rāṣṭra* (state).

Then Dr. S. D. Singh read his paper entitled "Royal Ownership of Land in the Vedic Period" and some discussion on the paper followed.

The house then took up the question of the nature and extent of the different types of taxes prevalent in ancient India. Prof. S. B. Chaudhuri said that Kauṭilya refers to the irrigation tax, and Dr. L. Gopal pointed out that the Smṛti texts do not mention irrigation tax.

Prof. Ray said that, from about the 8th century A.D. onwards, there was a tendency in the quantitative increase of taxation in India. He observed that the burden of taxation in India in the 11th and 12th centuries was terrible. Prof. Sircar disagreed and observed that epigraphic evidence goes against this view since sometimes we have long lists of taxes in earlier records and short lists of them in later epigraphs.

Then there was some discussion on the interpretation of the following terms—*bhoga, svabhoga, sambhoga, koṣṭhāgārika, dhruvasthānika, bhūmicchidra, koṣadaṇḍa, āvāta, svapitṛsvatvaka* etc. In this discussion, the participants were Prof. Sircar, Prof. Ray, Dr. Miss Niyogi, Dr. L. Gopal, Dr. S. D. Singh, Prof. S. B. Chaudhuri, Dr. H. V. S. Murthy, Dr. B. P. Mazumdar, Sri Brajadulal Chatterjee and Prof. R. S. Sharma.

Then there was a break for two hours (from 1 P.M. to 3 P.M.) for lunch.

Afternoon Session

The afternoon session took up the question whether there was pressure on land in the Gupta and post-Gupta periods.

Dr. S. K. Maiti held that there was pressure on land in the post-Gupta period and referred to the inscription of Nāthaśarman mentioning the purchase of only 1½ Kulyavāpa of land from 4 localities and to another inscription recording that an intending purchaser had to procure eleven *vāṭakas* of land from eight different villages. The Smṛti texts enjoin that one could cultivate waste or marshy lands without paying any taxes. This concession was granted evidently in view of the pressure on land. Moreover, the decline in the volume of foreign trade in the post-Gupta period, as is evident from the gold coins of Śaśāṅka preserved in the Indian Museum, might have been a factor for the pressure on land during that period.

Both Prof. Ray and Dr. Mazumdar supported Dr. Maiti's arguments regarding the pressure on land in the post-Gupta period.

But Prof. Sircar rejected the theory on the ground that there was never any dearth of waste land in Bengal and that the State is known to have been eager to dispose of such land with a view to extending the areas under cultivation. He referred to a tenth century inscription discovered in the Sylhet District of East Pakistan, which records the donation of a vast area of land to six thousand

Brāhmaṇas. Prof. Sircar also did not support the theory that trade with other countries declined in India in the post-Gupta period to a great extent. He referred to the trade relations of India during this period with the Arab world and with the lands beyond the Bay of Bengal.

Prof. Ray said that, in the Gupta period, there was a quantitative growth of trade and commerce and there was stable government. This led to the increase in population. It is a sociological proposition, Prof. Ray observed, that the increase in population in a rural agricultural economy is sure to lead to the pressure on land and, in fact, several epigraphs of the Gupta period record the reclamation of land. If the land charters belonging to the post-Gupta period onwards are chronologically arranged and studied, it is noticed that there was an increasing tendency to define the boundaries and measurements of land more precisely and meticulously. This, according to Prof. Ray, points to the increasing pressure on land. He further held that the price index of land is another indication of pressure on land. There are records, Prof. Ray pointed out, to show that the price of lands in areas like Comilla and Rajshahi was higher than that of the newly reclaimed lands in Faridpur. With regard to Indian trade with Suvarṇadvīpa as referred to by Prof. Sircar, Prof. Ray said that South-East Asia upto the 19th century was economically a backward country. So commerce with that country could not earn any balance of trade for India. Indian economy enjoyed the balance of trade through the Romans and the Arabs. India had no source of gold upto the 18th century. But the gold coins of the Kuṣāṇas and the Guptas, Prof. Ray pointed out, can only be explained by the Roman gold coming into India through trade channels. When there was a lesser quantity of gold in the coins of Kumāragupta and Skandagupta, it only points, Prof. Ray observed, to the decline of trade relations of India with the foreign countries wherefrom India used to earn gold in exchange of her merchantile commodities.

Dr. Mazumdar said in support of Prof. Ray's views that the existence of foreign trade with India could only be proved by the existence of gold coins because gold was then the only medium of exchange in the international trade.

Prof. Sircar disagreed with these views and pointed out that numerous Brāhmaṇa families migrated from U. P. to North Bengal (to which the inscriptions referred to by Dr. Maiti belong) during the post-Gupta period so much so that the Hili region became famous as Śrāvasti. He also referred to the innumerable instances of gold coins mentioned in the early medieval inscriptions especially of Southern India. He further pointed out that even barter could be the basis of international trade and that India did not require any gold coinage of her own in drawing Roman gold into her markets.

When Dr. Singh considered it quite logical that there was pressure on land in the more popular areas, Prof. Sharma raised the question whether there was an increase of towns in the post-Gupta period. A satisfactory answer to this question, Prof. Sharma thought, would throw some light on the question of pressure on land.

Sri Dilip Kumar Biswas said that, in ancient India, when new towns grew up, the older ones went out of existence.

Then Prof. Sharma raised the question whether there are records for the sale of land in ancient India for secular purposes.

Prof. Sircar referred to some Orissan records (e.g., the Kraya-śāsana of the time of Narendradhavala) recording the sale of land for secular purposes, and Dr. Mazumdar also pointed to some Central Indian epigraphs recording somewhat similar deeds. Dr. Gopal referred to an inscription alluding to the mortgage of land and wanted to know whether there is any document, either of the early or of the later period, mentioning the price of land.

Prof. Sircar said that the Damodarpur plates refer only to the concession price of state land for the purpose of

creating rent-free holdings, but that there are some South Indian inscriptions which mention the current prices of land.

When Prof. Sharma wanted to know how the absence or paucity of ancient Indian records for sale of land should be accounted for. Prof. Sircar pointed out that, according to the *Mitākṣarā*, the sale of land should also be treated as a gift. This, in Prof. Sircar's oplnion, explained the paucity of documents recording sale of land. He also said that the paucity of extant sale-records might also be due to the fact that many of these were written on perishable materials. Prof. Ray referred to some records preserved at the temples at Bhuvaneśvar and Rāmesvaram and drew attention to the land-sale records at the Bhuvaneśvara temple which have been edited by Sri Nirmal Kumar Bose.

Prof. Sharma then enumerated the topics discussed as follows :—

1. Ownership of land in ancient India.
2. Whether state ownership and Royal ownership were identical.
3. Ownership of land on the basis of the paper by Dr. S. D. Singh.
4. Burden of taxation on the people of ancient India.
5. Interpretation of some terms related to the land system.
6. Pressure of population on land in the Gupta and post-Gupta periods—its causes, external and internal.
7. Whether there was a decline in foreign trade in the post-Gupta period.
8. The balance of trade—its connection with gold coins.
9. Any increase in the number of towns in the post-Gupta period.
10. Sale of land for religious and secular purposes.
11. Paucity of records for sale-transactions of lands.

Then Prof. Sharma thanked Prof. Sircar, Prof. Ray, the delegates representing the different Universities of India and all those who participated in the seminar either by making comments and observations or by paying a patient hearing to the discussions at the seminar. The first day's seminar was closed at 5 P.M.

Reported by—
Sri Dipakchandra Bhattacharyya
Sri Mihirmohan Mukhopadhyay

I

Land System

D. C. Sircar, Calcutta University

Some scholars have expressed their views on the early Indian land system, though their writings appear to be based on a rather inadequate study of the epigraphical material. This is easily explained by the fact that the inscriptions in the various Indian languages are too many and their interpretation is difficult in many cases.

The Indian king was theoretically the lord of all land in his kingdom. There was difference of opinion between two groups of early Indian writers on the ownership of land. According to one of these schools, represented by Jaimini and Śabara and correctly understood by the author of the *Vyavahāramayūkha*, the king was not the owner of the land, but that he was only entitled to levy taxes from the holders of land. It is indicated that the king could acquire proprietary right on a plot of land under a tenant if only he purchased it from the latter. While the *Ṛgveda* represents one's field as a personal possession like his head of hair, the *Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra* refers to an old legend, according to which people suffering from the effects of anarchy first elected Vaivasvata Manu as their king and allotted to him $\frac{1}{6}$ share of the grains grown (*dhānya-ṣaḍbhāga*), $\frac{1}{10}$ of the merchandise (*paṇya-daśabhāga*) and a tax in cash (*hiraṇya*). Thus, in the opinion of the above school, the king collected taxes in exchange for the protection he offered to the subjects.

The other school represented by Manu, etc., acknowledges the king's responsibility for the subjects' protection, but regards him as a god in human form and the lord of all

CENTRAL LIBRARY

land. According to Megasthenes as well as a commentator on the *Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra*, land was the property of the king, and private persons were not entitled to own it. But the theoretical nature of the king's ownership of land under permanent tenants is clearly demonstrated by the reluctance of Indian monarchs to dispossess the subjects from their landed property. The Kārkoṭa section of Kalhaṇa's chronicle, which is believed to be based on authentic information, tells us how, about the beginning of the 8th century A.D., king Candrāpīḍa was reluctant to take away a plot of land in the possession of a tanner because it was 'other's land' and how ultimately he purchased the plot at the tanner's terms.

Land may be variously classified as cultivable, cultivated, uncultivable, fallow, barren, jungly, hilly, marshy, low, high, etc., etc. But from the king's point of view, it was of three classes viz. (1) State land, (2) land in the occupation of tenants who paid the king's dues according to agreed rates, and (3) land in more or less uninhabited and uncultivated areas over which State control varied under different circumstances. Each of these classes has its sub-divisions. Thus State land can be divided into (1) land attached to the king personally, (2) fiefs allotted to officers, subordinates and members of the royal family (3) land cultivated by State farms, (4) land cultivated by temporary tenants receiving half the share of the produce for their labour, and (5) uncultivated and waste land of various types. New villages were usually founded in areas which were more or less uninhabited and uncultivated. As regards State land in newly formed villages, Kauṭilya says (1) that land prepared for cultivation should be allotted to tax-payers only for life, (2) that unprepared land should not be taken away from people who were preparing them for cultivation, (3) that land could be taken away from those who were not cultivating it and could be allotted to others, and (4) that those who did not cultivate the land should pay for the loss of the State.

The State was eager to get its uncultivated fields cultivated and to keep them continuously under cultivation. The tenant who cultivated the land and paid the king's dues regularly had therefore little chance of being dispossessed of his field, because it was not easy for the State to cultivate all land freshly acquired or reclaimed. On the death of the tenant, his heirs could easily get a fresh lease, and, when the land would be thus enjoyed by a family for a few generations, it would have to be regarded as its permanent property according to the well-known principle—

adbhir = dattaṁ tribhir = bhuktaṁ sadbhiś = ca paripālitam /
etāni na nivartante pūrvarāja-kṛtāni ca //

The stanza states that a plot of land could not be confiscated by the State under the following circumstances : (i) when it was ceremonially granted by the king, (2) when it was in the possession of a family for three generations, (3) when care is taken for it by good tenants, and (4) when it is enjoyed by a tenant by virtue of the charter of an earlier king.

Many copper-plate grants state that land was granted to the gods and Brāhmaṇas according to the *bhūmicchidra-nyāya*, which means that the gift land was to be enjoyed as a free holding just as a person would enjoy a plot of land, brought by him under cultivation for the first time, without payment of taxes. The said *nyāya* refers to an interesting tenure, the principle being logical since the State does not pay anything for the reclamation of the land though it expects taxes on its re-allotment after the first tenant's death.

When a governor or vassal wanted to create a free holding in his fief or estate in favour of a god or a Brāhmaṇa, he applied to the king and apparently paid the price of the land at least on a theoretical basis. According to an old convention, $\frac{5}{6}$ of the religious merit accruing to the pious act of donation in such cases would go to the purchaser of the land, *i.e.* the real donor of the grant, and $\frac{1}{6}$ of it to the king whose government alone could really create a rent-free holding. The king's share of the merit

was equal to his share of the produce of the tenant's fields. If the State did not get any compensation for the loss of revenue, the merit accruing to the donation would not go to anybody other than the king. The royal charters however do not usually refer to the acceptance of compensation, but say that the free holding was created by the king at the request of a subordinate whose name was mentioned in the document only when he was of sufficient importance. When he became more powerful, he would himself issue charters with the king's permission, and, when still more powerful, his charter would not even mention the name of the overlord. The next stage would of course be represented by his charters issued as an independent monarch. Thus a landlord became a king. As to the creation of a free holding in a fief or estate, it has to be noticed that the holder of the fief or estate would lose the revenue income of the gift land so long as he would be in its occupation, while the State's loss was practically permanent. That is why compensation was paid, and it is made fairly clear by certain East Indian epigraphs of the Gupta age.

There are cases which represent the king as ratifying the creation of rent-free holdings by his subordinates in their fiefs. But the State was usually reluctant to mention in the charters the fact that the king was not the real donor of the grant. Sometimes the real donors are mentioned in the records without indicating their association with the grant while, in the Paramāra inscriptions, they are called *dāpaka*, i.e. 'one who has caused the gift'. But some East Indian inscriptions of the Gupta age referred to above record the sale of big plots of fallow land to applicants paying the usual price and the State's acceptance of their proposal for the creation of free holdings in favour of gods or Brāhmaṇas. The State's interest in such transactions is sometimes stated to be the king getting $\frac{1}{6}$ of the religious merit accruing to the pious act. Actually however the donees, who now became landlords, were expected to develop the area by founding

habitations, etc., so that the contiguous areas would be automatically developed at least partially and it would be easier for the State to complete the process of reclamation. Moreover, if a Brāhmaṇa donee died without leaving an heir or if he committed treason, the estate would be taken away by the State. Large areas of fallow and jungle land in Bengal were reclaimed by Brāhmaṇas and temple authorities in the way indicated above.

Besides escheat and a rebel's estate reverting to the donor, there were other recognised ways of confiscating donated lands without blemish. Thus, in a few charters of the Vākāṭakas and Yādavas, there are some specific conditions along with the statement that their violation would lead to the confiscation of the property granted to the Brāhmaṇa donees.

It is clear from epigraphic and literary records that pious kings generally respected the free holdings created by earlier rulers. But, at the same time, the charters exhibit a persistent fear of the donors that their gifts might be resumed by the future kings. This shows that unscrupulous rulers sometimes transformed free holdings into rent-paying property on flimsy grounds. Sometimes inscriptions recording sale of land and fixation of annual revenue also quoted old stanzas praising the gift of land and denouncing its resumption. This refers to the well-known convention that the sale of land should also be represented as a gift.

We have referred to the legend of Vaivasvata Manu, the first king who was allotted by the people $\frac{1}{6}$ share of the grains, $\frac{1}{10}$ share of the articles for sale and a tax in cash. According to Megasthenes, the king received $\frac{1}{4}$ of the produce and a land tribute apparently in cash besides other dues from traders, herdsmen, etc. Manu speaks of $\frac{1}{6}$, $\frac{1}{8}$ and $\frac{1}{12}$ of the grains as the king's share, of which $\frac{1}{6}$ seems to be the king's normal share of the principal crop of an area. This is supported by the official designation *Ṣaṣṭhādhikṛta*, i.e. the superintendent of the $\frac{1}{6}$ share, in the records of the Pālas. The collector of the king's grain-share was

called *dhruvādhikaraṇika*, i.e. superintendent of the office in charge of 'the fixed', in the Gujarat region. This seems to suggest that, in the said area, different rates were fixed for different types of fields, crops or tenants.

Although the lexicons recognise the words *kara*, *bali* and *bhāga* or *bhāgadheya* as synonyms, once *bali* and *bhāga* must have been regarded as different types of *kara* or revenue in general. Early epigraphic records make a clear distinction between *bali* and *bhāga*. Thus an inscription of Aśoka says how he visited a pilgrim spot which was made, on that occasion, *udbalika*, i.e. exempted from *bali*, the same as Tamil *umbaḷika*, *umbaḷam* or *umbaḷikkai*, and also *aṣṭabhāgika*, i.e. entitled to pay only $\frac{1}{8}$ of the produce as *bhāga* or the king's share. *Bali* here apparently means the land tax in cash mentioned by Megasthenes as also probably by Kauṭilya in the legend of Vaivasvata Manu. In a second century inscription of Rudradāman, we have two interesting passages, one enumerating the State's dues from the subjects as *kara* (levies in general), *viṣṭi* (unpaid labour) and *praṇaya-kriyā* (benevolence or emergency impost), and the other mentioning the king's revenue income as consisting of *bali* (land tax in cash), *śulka* (tolls, etc.) and *bhāga* (share of the produce of the tenants' fields). The word *kara* is conspicuous by its absence from the second passage apparently because *bali*, *śulka* and *bhāga* were regarded as three kinds of *kara*.

Bali originally meant the offerings to a deity as well as the tribute to a king. It was therefore at first whatever the king received from the subjects and the subdued rulers and peoples, the contributions from the subjects gradually developing into fixed taxes payable regularly for a definite period. At the same time, the word *bhāga* was becoming popular in the sense of the share of the crops payable by the tenants to the king, the proportion being soon standardised. *Bhāga* was thus originally the principal part of *bali*, though the latter gradually developed a distinct meaning. This is the reason why *bali* and *bhāga* were regarded as synonymous even in later works.

CENTRAL LIBRARY

A Śātavāhana epigraph mentions the king's levies as *deya* (what has to be offered or paid in cash) and *meya* (what has to be paid after measurement). *Meya* here seems to be the same as *bhāga* while *deya* is the same as either *bali* or the periodical offerings of fruits, etc., payable to the king, which was later called *bhoga*.

The charters of the Śarabhapura kings of the 6th century A. D. mention the royal dues as *bhoga-bhāga*. The records of the Uccakalpa kings of the same age have (1) *kara-pratyāya* or income in the shape of *kara*, (2) *bhāga-bhogakara-pratyāya* or income in the form of *kara* levied as *bhāga* and *bhoga*, (3) *bhāgabhogakara-hiraṇy-ādi-pratyāya* or income including *bhāgabhogakara* and *hiraṇya* which means tax payable in cash, (4) *śulka-bhāgabhogakara-hiraṇy-ādi-pratyāya* in which *śulka* or tolls is added to the list, and (5) *bhāga-bhogakara-hiraṇy-āvātāy-ādi-pratyāya* which includes *āvāt-āya* or income resulting from storms. There is really no question of a gradual increase in the number of the levies since the records cover only a few decades. The difference in the lists is due to the difference in the extent of the king's favour to the various donees or to special circumstances.

In the expression *dhānya-hiraṇya* found in records like those of the Maitrakas, *dhānya* or grains means either *bhāga* or the small contributions in grains often made for the maintenance of local officials like the village watchman. When *tulyameya* (what has to be weighed and what has to be measured) is mentioned along with *bhāgabhogakarahiraṇya*, it may mean tolls on commodities sold in the markets.

Firewood, shrubs and particular trees in the land under unprivileged tenants could not be owned by the latter. There is evidence to show that even the branch of a tree brought down by storms could not be appropriated by an ordinary tenant. In one case, a person purchasing a plot of land from ordinary tenants is known to have acquired the right to own certain trees only when the king made the property a rent-free holding in his favour. Whether he paid some money to the state for this purpose is not clearly stated ;

but any such right could be purchased. There is clear mention in one record that even *aṣṭabhoga-tejaḥsvāmya* or complete control involving all the eight kinds of enjoyment of landed property could be secured by means of purchase. This *aṣṭa-bhoga* is sometimes enumerated as (1) treasuretrove, (2) deposits or accumulations on the soil, (3) fishing rights in waters, (4) quarrying rights in hills, (5) actual income, (6) future income, (7) income from land already under cultivation, and (8) income from land that may be brought under cultivation in future.

In some cases (as in the Semra plates), the donees were empowered to sell or mortgage the gift land while, in others (as in the Purushottampuri plates), such a right was withheld from them. Some grants are stated to have been made in accordance with the custom governing permanent endowments, which means that the donees were entitled to enjoy only the income from the gift land, but had no power to sell it. The same thing is indicated in some Orissan records as 'the condition of no employment of the pen [for writing out a fresh deed concerning the land]'.

A Sena inscription shows that, when a free holding was sold, it became rent-paying property, and the same must have been the case when such land was given in mortgage. That the smaller tenants were also entitled to sell their landed property is clear from the Sena and Maitraka records. The Maitraka charters often mention the gift land as the *pratyāya* or property of a tenant such as a carpenter or an agriculturist householder, and it is apparent that the king purchased the land from them in order to gain religious merit by granting it in favour of gods and Brāhmaṇas. A Śaka ruler of the Nasik-Poona region is known to have visited the Puṣkara-tīrtha where he puchased a plot of land from its Brāhmaṇa holder, at the cost of a large sum of money, for making a free gift after taking his bath in the holy waters of the Puṣkara lakes.

The rights of the donees were not the same in different charters especially of different regions and ages. Of course

the vague indication of 'all exemptions or customary privileges' often found in the documents suggests that there was a general agreement on the nature of the privileges at least in an area or a kingdom in a particular age.

Sometimes the gift land enjoyed complete freedom from the entry of *Bhaṭas* and *Cāṭas* or *Chātras*, i.e. Pāiks and Barkandāzes, who were however entitled to enter into the free holding, according to some charters, only to deal with cases of theft or of theft and treason. In many records, the power to deal with cases involving 'the 10 offences' was granted to the donee. According to the *tribhog-ābhyantara-siddhi*, the donee was entitled to enjoy only $\frac{1}{3}$ of the income from the gift land while, under the *pannasa* tenure, he could enjoy $\frac{1}{2}$ of it. Likewise, the *brāhmaṇa-viṁśati* tenure would allow the donee to enjoy $\frac{1}{5}$ of the income. Sometimes a small rent of about 200 *paṇas* (equivalent to about 16000 cowrie-shells or a little over $12\frac{1}{2}$ silver coins) was fixed for free holdings.

Persons of non-Brāhmaṇa communities also sometimes received free holdings from the king either ás a reward for their sevices or by purchase. Grants made for the maintenance of the families of warriors of different communal groups, who died fighting on the king's behalf were called *mṛtyuka-vṛtti*, *rakta-mānya*, etc. A Gaṅga king of Orissa is known to have created a *vaiśy-āgrahāra*, i.e. a free holding in favour of the mercantile class, after receiving 150 silver coins from the donees. Late medieval epigraphs of the Vijayanagara kings speak of a tenure according to which a person enjoyed royal land on condition that he would help the king with forces whenever required. But such a thing is unknown from the records of earlier ages.

When a village was granted, the tenants belonging to it were generally advised by the donor to pay to the donee whatever was so long been paid to the king. In a few cases, certain tenants, artisans and traders were specially attached to the gift village. The tenants and others were often asked to be obedient to the donee and not to cause any obstruction

to his enjoyment of the gift land. Thus a landlord was created by relegating the king's rights over the village to the donee. The charters suggest the existence of several kinds of such landlords, e.g., (1) those who enjoyed complete freedom from taxes and obligations, (2) those whose estates were partially exempted from obligations and paid a nominal tax, and (3) those who were not exempted from obligations. When the charter creating the free holding was lost and the estate fell into the rent-paying category, the king issued a fresh document after an official investigation.

The boundaries of the free holdings were often clearly mentioned or demarcated ; but sometimes it was considered unnecessary to mention them in detail because they were well marked and also well known to the people of the locality.

Some of the following are mentioned in certain charter in connection with the free holdings : (1) boundaries, grass land and pasture land, (2) the surface of, the space above and the region under the ground, (3) what is above and under the ground, (4) approaches, ingress and egress, (5) movable and immovable belongings, (6) land and waters, (7) pits and barren spots, (8) mines of salt and metals, (9) fallow land and cultivated plots of land, (10) market places and landing stations, (11) trees, creepers, shrubs, branches, hemp, sugar-cane, etc., (12) orchards, wells, step-wells, springs and water-falls, (13) temples and ramparts, (14) ponds, tanks, rivers and hills, (12) wood, bricks and stones, (16) domestic and wild animals, birds, aquatic beings, fish and tortoise, (17) mounds and waste land attached to the village, (18) platforms for collection of tolls and records in the custody of local officials, (19) houses, house-sites, threshing floors and their sites, etc., (20) dwellings or households of artisans, cultivators and traders, (21) areas producing fish and betel-vines, etc., etc. But all these are never specifically mentioned together in one record or a group of records. There is some regional element in the specification. Thus tortoise is only known from Orissan documents while springs and waterfalls are mentioned in the epigraphs of the Himalayan region.

BCU 219

The tax burden and obligations of the tenants were heavy. An 8th century king is known to have held the view that villagers should not be left with more food than required for one year's consumption nor more oxen than are required for the tillage of their fields, because, if they were allowed to accumulate wealth, they would become in a single year formidable landlords strong enough to disregard the king's commands. This shows that the tenants, at least in some parts of the country, had the opportunity of becoming rent-paying landlords if the kings were not oppressive.

The privileges going with rent-free holdings indirectly refer to a large number of taxes and obligations of both the landlords and the tenants. All of them are never mentioned together in a single record. Even in the early inscriptions of the Śātavāhanas and the Pallavas, only some of them are enumerated with the phrase 'and all kinds of exemptions' and 'the 18 kinds of exemptions beginning with.....' Some charters merely state that the grants were made together with all the usual privileges without specifying them. But, in spite of certain regional variations and modifications due to change of time, the obligations are more or less of the same type.

The following are some of the numerous items noticed in various epigraphical records : (1) obligation to supply to the king or landlord on occasions and to the touring officers or local officials such articles as rice, cooking pot, firewood, accommodation, servants, milk, curds, gruel, myrobalan, vegetables, flowers, bullocks and cows, hide-seats, charcoal, etc., (2) taxes in general, (3) profession tax on artisans, (4) tax for producing salt, sugar, toddy, etc., (5) supply of unpaid labour, (6) surrender of treasure-troves and deposits, (7) fixed taxes and occasional levies including the tax on temporary tenants, (8) supply of sacrificial animals, (9) tax on shopkeepers and shops of metal and leather workers, (10) tax on the outcastes, masked actors, water-diviners, weavers and barbers, (11) tax on marriage and gambling, (12) tax for the maintenance of

spies, surveyors, gate-keepers or toll-collectors, etc., (13) tax on artisans enjoying free holdings, (14) presents of various kinds to be made on different occasions, (15) payment of small quantities of grains per month, (16) 2 handfuls per *puṭṭi* measure of grains payable to the village officials, (17) tax on uncultivated land, (18) surrender of half the produce of the fields, (19) levy for the supervision of partition of land and other property, (20) taxes in kind and cash, (21) income from changes caused by natural agencies and cyclones, (22) fines for the 10 offences, (23) all fines and exactions, (23) restriction on the ownership of various trees, etc., (24) restriction on the production of certain crops, (25) confiscation of the property of one dying without leaving an heir, (26) income from the bees such as honey and wax, (27) power to deal with cases of abduction of unmarried girls, (28) appropriation of all sources of income, (29) appropriation of all internal revenue incomes, (30) power to deal with the recovery of stolen goods, (31) power to assess taxes afresh, (32) obligation relating to the supply of free labour, (33) tax on the merchants, (34) taxes relating to the Turuṣkas, Andhras and Tiguḷas or Tamils, (35) profession tax on the wrestlers, (36) payment of one silver coin on the occasion of the birth of a prince, (37) water tax for fishing rights, (38) cattle tax for grazing rights, (39) tax for the possession of race bullocks, (40) fixed or regular taxes and occasional or irregular taxes, (41) perquisites for hereditary officers, (42) quarrying rights in the hills, (43) dues payable for the maintenance of armed constables, (44) income from the receipts of the examiner of coins, (45) tax for the maintenance of elephants, (46) levy on amounts lent out by the money-lenders, (47) levy on amounts realised by the money-lenders, (48) levy on the arrears of taxes or fines, (49) levy for the maintenance of or profession tax on snake-charmers, (50) levy for the medical treatment of the king when he is sick, (51) fine in lieu of imprisonment, (52) presents to be made to the king especially when he returns from a military campaign, (53) tax for the maintenance

of swordsmen, (54) tax for the maintenance of Pāiks, (55) transit duties, (56) profession tax on the goldsmiths, (57) tax for the grazing and watering of cattle, (58) obligation to supply uncooked food, (59) collective tax for land partitioned among cultivators, etc., etc.

[The majority of the points raised here and summarily discussed, have been dealt with in my recently published work entitled *Indian Epigraphy* as also in my forthcoming work *Indian Epigraphical Glossary* and my R. K. Mookerji Lectures on 'Landlordism and Tenancy in Ancient and Medieval India as revealed by Epigraphical Records' delivered at the University of Lucknow in November 1964.]

II

Royal Ownership of Land in the Vedic Period

Sarva Daman Singh, Lucknow University

In the story of man stretching across many millennia of the past, he first roamed the forests in search of food, but later learnt to cultivate the land and domesticate the cattle. Food production marked the first revolution in human history; and agriculture led to the growth of permanent settlements. Land assumed an importance it had never had before. The first evidence of food-producing cultures in India comes from Baluchistan. The District of Quetta was extensively inhabited as early as the fourth millennium B.C.; a fertile soil, abundant supply of water, and men and ideas from Iran resulted in the growth of agriculture at places like Kile Gul Mohammad; large villages sprang into existence.[1] Clan structure and community based on kinship

1. Cf. Fairservis, Excavations in the Quetta Valley and Archaeological Survey in the Zhob and Loralai Districts, West Pakistan, in the Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History, Vol. 45, Pt. 2, pp. 169-401, and Vol. 47, Pt. 2, pp. 277-448; Beatrice de Cardi, Fresh Problems from Baluchistan, *Antiquity*, Vol. XXXIII (1959), pp. 15-28.

appear, however, to have survived the neolithic revolution. But we do not know whether land at this stage was owned individually or communally. Among barbarians today, as pointed out by Childe,[1] land is normally held by the clan in common. Plots are allotted to individual families for use only and redistributed annually. Pastures remain, of course, the common property of the entire clan. By analogy thus, if not by proof, we may visualise a similar stage of affairs in the neolithic age of India's evolution.

The discovery of metals, copper and its alloys, specialisation in labour, foreign trade and surplus wealth heralded the growth of cities; effective weapons of offence and defence facilitated the conquest of the surrounding environment as well as the diffusion of populations over wider areas. The size of Harappā and Mohenjodaro leaves little doubt that populalions as least as large as those of the contemporary Mesopotamian cities were supported by the surplus produced by a rural peasantry.[2] And the concentration of this social surplus by a divine ruler or a small priestly caste may be deduced from the embattled acropolis or citadel both at Mohenjodaro and Harappā, and the imposing granaries at both the sites.[3] The great granary at Mohenjodaro, excavated in 1950, must have originally measured 150 by 75 feet, before an enlargement became necessary.[4] And the granaries at Harappā were as many as twelve, with a total floor-space that exceeded 9000 square feet.[5] We can easily imagine how the commodity so vital to civic prosperity was administered and distributed by

---

1. Childe, *What happened in History*, Harmondsworth, 1950, p. 66.
2. Cf. Stuart Piggott, *Prehistoric India*, p. 153.
3. Childe, *op. cit.*, p. 127; Wheeler, *Early India and Pakistan*, p. 97; *The Dawn of Civilization* (ed. Piggott). London, 1961, pp. 244-46.
4. Wheeler, *The Indus Civilization*, Cambridge, 1953, p. 31.
5. Wheeler in *The Dawn of Civilization*, pp. 245-46. At Lothal, too, 'a substructure with criss-cross ducts between a series of mud-brick blocks, each 12 feet square, is probably the basis of a granary similar in principle to that of Mohenjodaro'. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 246.

officials, and how Goverment tithes filled and refilled these granaries.[1] In a moneyless period of history, these granaries must really have represented the public treasuries. The preparation of flour was also part of a controlled economy fully cognizant of organised labour.[2]

The immense extent of the Harappān Civilization embracing an area of nearly half a million square miles, and its singular uniformity tempts Sir Mortimer Wheeler to think of 'the vastest political experiment before the advent of the Roman Empire'.[3] The idea of a mature, literate, urban civilization seems to have come to India from Mesopotamia,[4] and, in the 24th century B.C., 'an imperialistic regime had emerged in Akkad and may have influenced or even been influenced by contemporary political development of the Indus'.[5] But we cannot be certain as to the ownership of land in the Harappān period. In the Indus cities, the ruler or rulers seem to have been invested with priestly attributes as well as temporal power sufficient to order a planned construction of cities and citadels, to enforce the laws of civic life, and to levy tithes in grains from the rural peasantry. This tax, it seems, was not levied only in lieu of the protection afforded them, but as rent from farmers of lands supposed to be the property of their gods, or their own in effect, since they were perhaps the supreme interpreters of the gods' will as their representatives on earth. Thus the concept of royal ownership of land in India may be, at least in an embryonic form, as old as the days of Harappā and Mohenjodaro.[6] This suggestion is, however, purely hypothetical.

---

1. In Egypt, too, granaries existed for the collection of taxes. Cf. Wheeler, *The Indus Civilization*, p. 24.
2. Piggott, *op. cit.*, p. 154.
3. Wheeler, *Early India and Pakistan*, p. 98.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 102.
5. *Loc. cit.*
6. In Egypt, in theory at least, the whole land belonged to the Pharaoh, and its surplus produce found its way into the royal treasuries and

The advent of the Aryans in India synchronises with the death or destruction of the cities of the Indus valley. The Vedic evidence proves beyond doubt that the office of the king, the supreme commander in battle, grew out of warfare.[1] Indra is the divine prototype of the idolised leader of war, the saviour and conqueror, who rises to kingship.[2] 'Kingship originates in military necessity and derives its validity from consent'.[3] The clashing interests of the people were harmonised by the surrender of all to an independent authority less ethereal than a mythical deity ; and the mortal king succeeded better with his priestly advisers in ensuring the security of his followers. The Aryan invasion of India led to the growth of the monarchic element, just as it did also in the case of Greece.[4]

But was the Vedic king the owner of the land of his realm ? In the absence of categorical statements in the Vedic literature, we have to view this question in the light of the political developments that took place in the fullness of time. The most important function of the king, as we have seen, was to fight in order to protect his own people[5] as well as to retain and enhance his own position. Thus the *Atharva Veda* addresses the monarch : 'Of lion aspect, do thou devour all the clans (*viś*) : of tiger aspect, do thou beat down the foes ; sole chief, having Indra as companion, having conquered, seize thou on the enjoyments of them that play the foe.'[6]

---

granaries. Cf. Childe, *op. cit.*, p. 120. For land tenure in ancient Mesopotamia, see *ibid.*, pp. 94, 100, 101, 155.

1. Cf. S. D. Singh, *Ancient Indian Warfare with Special Reference to the Vedic Period*, Leiden, 1964, pp. 135, 136.
2. *RV*, I, 103. 5 ; VIII. 35. 17 ; SV, IV. II, 4. 1 ; *AB*, VIII. 4. 12 ; cf. *RV*, I. 53. 7 ; I. 32. 6 ; I. 33. 12 ; I. 63. 7 ; I. 131. 4 ; I. 174. 2 ; II. 20. 7. 8 ; III. 34. 1 ; IV. 30. 20, etc.
3. Beni Prasad, *Theory of Government in Ancient India*, 1927, p. 15. Cf. *TS*, III. 4. 4 1.
4. S. D. Singh, *loc. cit.*
5. *RV*, III. 43. 5 : *gopā janasya* ; IX. 35. 5 : *janasya gopatiḥ*.
6. *AV*, IV. 22. 7.

War thus led to the growth of states and governments. Even peace was armed; military preparedness was imperative to avoid or resist an enemy's strike. The king became the keystone of the military and administrative arch. He rose from power to power and even assumed despotic airs,[1] while the semblance of popular choice and acceptance was yet retained. The growth of kingdoms and the need for coalescence in a land of limitless horizons prompted the doctrine of universal conquest and a universal ruler. It manifested itself in sacrifices like the *aśvamedha*: kings marched on their neighbours to exact obeisance as well as obedience; righteous conquest, as it was called, started as early as the later Vedic period. The universal ruler is described in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* as sole ruler (*ekarāṭ*) and possessed of the whole earth (*sārvabhauma*) bordered by the ocean.[2] Thus in the later Vedic period lesser chiefs were tributary to greater; terms such as *adhirāja* and *samrāṭ* imply feudatories who were reduced to vassalage by conquest rather than by contract. Says the *Taittirīya Saṁhitā*[3]: 'Indra shall conquer, he shall not be conquered; overlord among kings shall he rule; in all conflicts shall he be a protector, that he may be reverenced and honoured.' That is how overlordship arose out of war, with its corollaries, heredity and despotism.

In might and majesty, therefore, the king was without a second in his realm, and if he could conquer neighbours and exact tributes from them, his mastery over his own people must have been unchallenged. As the lord of his people and realm he protected both, and we cannot help feeling that with the passage of time and consolidation of his power and authority, he must have come to regard himself as the owner of all the land in his dominions. He is likened to the gods and even partially deified. The title

---

1. Cf. *RV*, IV. 42: the boast of Trasadasyu, 'I am Indra. I am Varuṇa'.
2. *AB*, VIII. 15.
3. *TS*, II. 4. 14. 2.

rājan is applied in the *Ṛgveda* to such gods as Indra, Mitra, Varuṇa, Soma, Yama, Agni and Bṛhaspati;[1] while numerous other passages emphasize the similarity of their royal function.[2] King Purukutsa is described as an *ardhadeva*,[3] and Parikṣit is styled as 'a god among men'.[4] And the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* represents the king as the manifestation of Prajāpati.[5] The gods own land, water and life, and so do the kings on the mortal plane. Indra is called the king of all the quarters ;[6] indeed, the Earth or *Bhūmi* chose him as her lord ;[7] and if he is the lord of land, so is an earthly king referred to as human Indra.[8] The inexorable logic of military might and secular authority places the king in a position of command that in fact grows increasingly impatient of interference.

The *Atharva Veda* describes a king as 'the overcomer of people',[9] indeed, as the *Satapatha Brāhmaṇa*[10] observes, he establishes himself among a numerous people, and subdues them even from a single dwelling, and *takes possession of whatever he likes*. The people are likened to a female devoid of energy,[11] and the *Pañcaviṁśa Brāhmaṇa* states plainly that 'courage leads to mastery over the peasantry'. This preponderance of power must have looked askance at suggestions that royal rights were altogether innocent of the notion of

---

1. Cf. Index to Griffith's *RV*, Vols. I-II.
2. *RV*, I. 67. 1 ; IV. 4. 1 ; VII. 18. 2 ; I. 130. 1.
3. *RV*, IV. 42. 8-9.
4. *AV*, XX. 127. 7 : *yo devo martyān adhi*. Divinity for a king was not claimed in complete or absolute terms; but that is beside the point here.
5. *ŚB*, V. 1. 5. 14. Manu, VII. 7 ; VII. 3, may be harking back to earlier days.
6. *AV*, VI. 98. 3 ; cf. *TS*, II. 4. 14. 1 ; *MS*, IV. 12. 2.
7. *AV*, XII. 1. 37.
8. *AV*, III. 4. 6. Cf. also *AV*, XIX. 24. 2 ; *MS*, II. 1. 4 ; *AB*, VII. 23. 1.
9. *AV*, VI. 98. 2 ; cf. *MS*, IV. 12. 2.
10. *ŚB*, I. 3. 2. 14, 15 ; cf. also III. 9. 3. 7.
11. *ŚB*, II. 5. 2. 36.
12. *PB*, VI. 10. 11.

ownership. The *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*[1] also refers to the Vaiśya as tributary to another (*anyasya balikṛt*), to be lived on by another (*anyasy=ādyaḥ*) and to be oppressed and ill-treated at will (*yathākāmajyeyaḥ*). The last seems to mean that the king or Kṣatriya can remove the Vaiśya without cause from his land. Macdonell and Keith hold that the expulsion of the Vaiśya does not bear out the quasi-ownership of land by the king or Kṣatriya ; 'it is an act of royal authority, not an incident of tenure'.[2] But if royal authority could at all times be exercised at will without any reference to the subject's wishes, it must have been in effect as good as faith in the principle of ownership.

Gradually, thus, the king came to be vaguely regarded as lord of all the land, as, of course, the idea was not a primitive one. 'Devouring' the people, though, was, according to the authors of the *Vedic Index*, a political power, not a right of ownership.[3] But the very idea of political power must have grown out of a sense of overlordship or symbolic ownership. It is difficult to imagine that this political power was based simply on people's willingness to recognise it without coercion or compulsion.[4] The over-all ownership of the king need not be incompatible with private ownership of land for all practical purposes, normally subject to the payment of the king's dues. Or, if we like, we may describe it as a joint ownership, the king leaving his partners free to dispose of their land as they pleased, provided that he got his share of the produce unimpaired. *Balikṛt* or the payment of tribute to the king is mentioned as early as the *Ṛgveda*.[5] The *Atharva Veda*[6] also refers to the king's

1. *AB*, VII. 29. 3.
2. See *Vedic Index*, II, p. 256, n 74.
3. *Ibid*, p. 215.
4. As pointed out by R. S Sharma, the contract theory in ancient India was calculated to emphasize the power of the king rather than that of the people. Cf. *Aspects of Political Ideas and Institutions in Ancient India*, 1959, p. 234
5. *RV*, VII. 6. 5 ; X, 173. 6 ; also see *Vedic Index*, s.v. *bali*.
6. *AV*, IV, 22. 3.

CALCUTTA CENTRAL

share in a village. And the *Śatapatha*[1] thus sums up the position: 'whatever belongs to the people, in that the chieftain has a share.' The *bhāga-dugha* or the 'milcher of the share,' listed amongst the king's *ratnins* in the *Yajurveda Saṁhitās* and the *Brāhmaṇas*, may have been a collector of taxes, as also explained by Sāyaṇa.[2] *Bhāga*, as we know, is the regular word for compulsory tax.[3]

The expression *grāma-kāma*, occurring not infrequently in the later *Saṁhitās*, points to the king's grant of his royal prerogatives over villages to his favourites, so far as fiscal matters were concerned. As the king came to be regarded as the owner of all land, the owners of such grants became landlords. The cultivators were thus reduced to tenancy, and the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* speaks of the Kṣatriya's right to apportion land.[5]

The *Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa*[6], however, tells us that the king cannot make a gift of the entire earth in the *viśvajit* sacrifice, when he has to give everything that belongs to him. The earth is common and does not belong to the sovereign alone. And the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*[7], too, tells of Viśvakarman Bhauvana, who, intent on giving the earth to his priest Kaśyapa after a sacrifice, was reproved by the Earth herself: 'No mortal must give me away....' But even these passages perhaps prove the contrary to be true, if they are construed as protests against the arbitrary gifts of land by

---

1. *ŚB*, IX. 1. 1 18.
2. *TS*, I. 8. 9. 2; *TB*, I. 7 3 5; III. 4. 8. 1; *ŚB*, V. 3. 1. 9. Cf. RS. Sharma, *op. cit.*, pp. 108, 109, 133,
3. But the term *bali* was also used to denote compulsory taxes even in later times. Cf. Sharma, *op. cit.*, p. 132. In ancient Assyria, too, the term 'gift' was used for regular taxes cnmpulsorily levied. Cf. Olmstead, *History of Assyria*, p. 516.
4. *TS*, II. 1. 1, 2; 3. 2; 3. 9. 2; *MS*, II. 1. 9; 2. 3; IV. 2. 7, etc.
5. *ŚB*, VII. 1. 1. 8.
6. *JB*, VI 7. 3.
7. *ŚB*, XIII. 7. 1. 14-15. Cf. Spellman, *Political Theory of Ancient India*, Oxford, 1964, p. 204.

kings. These scriptural injunctions seem only to have been dictated by the necessity to call a halt to the king's commands ever impinging on the rights of commoners.

This, of course, is not to say that all things were royally owned, and there was no freedom of private property. Fields carefully measured[1] doubtless indicate individual ownership of land for purposes of cultivation. And this is also suggested by Apālā's reference to her father's field as a personal possession.[2] The epithets *urvarā-sā*, *urvarā-jit*, *kṣetra-sā*, meaning 'winning fields', seem to bear out the point. The existence of separate holdings as early as the Ṛgvedic days is indicated by the name of the deity *kṣetrasya pati* or the god presiding over each field.[3] Fields are mentioned in the same connection as children,[4] and the conquest of fields is referred to in the *Saṁhitās*.[5] And in the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*,[6] fields and houses are mentioned as examples of wealth.

Royal ownership of land did not thus mean the negation of the people's rights in land. It was a gradation of ownership ; the rights of the king were superimposed over those of the people without undue hindrance to their right to till, to sow and reap their harvest, to inherit and to partition their land.

1. *RV*, I. 110 5.
2. *RV*, VIII. 91. 5.
3. Cf. *The Vedic Age*, p. 358.
4. *RV*, IV. 41. 6.
5. *TS*, III. 2. 8. 5 ; *KS*, V. 2 ; *MS*, IV. 12. 3.
6. *CHU*, VII. 24. 2.

III

प्राचीनभारते भूनियमाः

LAND SYSTEM IN ANCIENT INDIA

लेखकः—P. N. Pattabhiramasastri.

पवित्रतमेऽस्मिन् भारते देशस्य गौरवं समेधयितुं समाजञ्च परिष्कर्तुं देशहितैकचिन्तका नीतिकुशला निर्लोलुपा मनु-याज्ञवल्क्य-गौतमप्रभृतयो महर्षयः संख्यातीतान् नीतिधर्मग्रन्थान् प्रणीय मानवानस्मानन्वग्रहन्। समाजान्तर्गता विभिन्नसम्प्रदायानुयायिन एकयैव नीत्या संस्कृत्या च प्रबद्धा एकरूपा यथा भवेयुः तथा प्राचीनानां यत्न आसीदिति तैः प्रणीतैर्ग्रन्थैः प्रतीयते। ते नीतिशास्त्रमर्थशास्त्रञ्चैकरूपं विधाय धर्ममूलकत्वमपि तस्य सम्पादयामासुः। अर्थकामैकप्रधाना सामाजिकी व्यवस्था देशस्य न हिताय स्यादिति तेऽमन्यन्त। यावत्तत्र धर्मसम्बन्धो न स्यात्तावत्तत् परिपूर्णं न भवेदिति तेऽभिप्रयन्ति स्म। धर्मश्चात्र न सम्प्रदायावलम्बी तैः पर्यगण्यत। सर्वसाधारणाः केचन धर्माः, ये च संस्कृतिशब्देन व्यवह्रियन्ते, तेषां सर्वत्रावश्यकतां तेऽपश्यन्। अत एव—

'अर्थशास्त्रात्तु बलवद्धर्मशास्त्रमिति स्थितिः'

इति वदन् याज्ञवल्क्यः धर्मस्य प्राधान्यं मन्यते। अर्थशास्त्रनिर्माता चाणक्योऽपि—

'शास्त्रं विप्रतिपद्येत धर्मन्यायेन केनचित्।
न्यायस्तत्र प्रमाणं स्यात् ... ...'॥

(अर्थशास्त्र, 3. 1. 58)

इति कथयन् विषयमिममुपष्टभ्नाति।

कामसूत्रप्रणेता वात्स्यायनोऽपि विषयमिमं द्रढीकरोति—'शास्त्रस्यानभिशङ्कात्वात् ··· चरेद्धर्मानिति वात्स्यायनः' (कामसूत्रम्, 2. 25)

'किं स्यात्परत्रेत्याशङ्का कार्ये यस्मिन्न जायते।
न चार्थघ्नं सुखघ्नेति शिष्टास्तत्र व्यवस्थिताः' ॥
(कामसूत्रम्, 2. 39)

इति च ब्रुवन्। धर्मार्थकामेषु पुरुषार्थेषु पूर्वपूर्वस्य ज्यायस्त्वमभिप्रेत्य कामसूत्रटीकायां जयमङ्गलायां श्रीयशोधर उदाहरति—

'अपि नाम त्रिवर्गेऽस्मिन् सेवेतोत्तरबाधकम्।
पूर्वस्य तु प्रधानत्वान्न सेव्यः पूर्वबाधकः' ॥ इति।

एभिः प्रमाणैः धर्मसंवलितार्थकामप्रधानैव सामाजिकी व्यवस्था प्राचीनैराद्रतेति स्पष्टमवगम्यते।

तत्र भारतस्य प्राचीनेतिहासे विमृश्यमाने भूनियमविषये सुन्दरः प्रकार आसीदिति प्रतीयते। राज्यप्रशासकानां राज्ञां भूमिषु यत्स्वामित्वं तत्करग्रहणमात्रेण पर्यवसितमासीत्।[1] स्वामी सन्नपि राजा एकस्य स्वमन्यस्मै दातुं दापयितुं वा न प्रभुः। तस्यैकाधिपत्ये विद्यमानेऽपि शास्त्रानुवर्तनं मुख्यं तस्याभवत्।

'प्रजासुखं सुखं राज्ञः प्रजानाञ्च हिते हितम्।
नात्मप्रियं हितं राज्ञः प्रजानान्तु प्रियं हितम्' ॥
(अर्थशास्त्र, 1. 19. 16)

इति कौर्तयन् चाणक्यः एकाधिपत्यावस्थायामपि राज्ञः प्रजानुवर्तित्वमावश्यकमिति द्योतयति। भूमिषु प्रजानां स्वत्वं जन्मतस्सिद्धं लौकिकं तत्त्वम्। अत्र विज्ञानेश्वरप्रभृतयः पूर्वजास्सुविचार्य विषयमिमं निर्णीतवन्तः। तथाहि—'स्वामी रिक्थत्रय-संविभागपरिग्रहाधिगमेषु

1. 'चतुर्थमंशं धान्यानां षष्ठं वस्त्रानाम्' (अर्थशास्त्र 5.2.90) इति चाणक्यः करस्य प्रमाणं वदति।

ब्राह्मणस्याधिकं लब्धम्, क्षत्रियस्य विजितम्, निर्विष्टं वैश्यशूद्रयोः' इति गौतमेन भूस्वामित्वे साधारणा असाधारणाश्च उपाया उपदिष्टाः। रिक्थो दायः, स चाप्रतिबन्धः; क्रयः द्रव्यविनिमयेन पदार्थप्राप्तिः; संविभागः सप्रतिबन्धो दायः; परिग्रहः प्रीत्युपहारादिना प्राप्तस्य स्वीकारः; अधिगमः निध्यादिरूपेण प्राप्तिः। इमे सर्वसाधारणाः। प्रतिग्रहेण लाभो ब्राह्मणस्य, जयेन क्षत्रियस्य, कृष्यादिना वैश्यस्य, शुश्रूषादिना शूद्रस्येत्यसाधारणाः। एभिरुपायैः प्राप्तेषु भूम्यादिषु स्वामित्वं परिगण्यते। अत्र गौतमः उपायान्न विदधाति, द्रव्यार्जने रागतः प्राप्तेषूपायेषु प्रतिग्रहादीन्नियमयति। नियमपुरस्सरमर्जितं वस्तु पुरुषार्थं भवति। पुरुषार्थेषु क्रत्वनुष्ठानमप्यन्तर्भवतीति तन्निर्वृत्तिः नियमानुसारमर्जितेन द्रव्येण सम्पादनीया। विषयोऽयं जैमिनिना लिप्सासूत्रे (जै० सू०, 4. 1. 2) विचार्य निर्णीतः। एवञ्च साधारणै-रसाधारणैर्वोपायैरधिगतेषु भूम्यादिषु लोकानां स्वामित्वं जन्मतस्सिद्ध-मिति शास्त्रसम्मतः पन्थाः।

एतादृशाः स्वामिनः प्रायस्त्रिविधा भवन्ति—प्रभूतस्य भूभागस्य स्वामिनः केचन, ये च माण्डलिक(जमींदार)पदेन व्यवह्रियन्ते स्म, अपरे च यथानियमं सम्पादितस्याल्पीयसो भूभागस्य स्वामिनः, अन्ये चान्यदीयं भूभागं 'भुक्त'रूपेण लेख्यद्वारा परिगृह्य वर्षत्रयं वर्षपञ्चकं वर्षदशकं वा स्वायत्तीकुर्वन्ति।

तत्र प्रभूतभूभागस्वामिनः कर्षण-समीकरण-बीजावाप-कर्तनादि-व्यापारेषु यो व्ययभारस्तं स्वीकृत्य कर्षकान् नियोज्य सस्यसमृद्धिं विवर्धयन्तः कर्षकेभ्यश्चतुर्थमंशं प्रशासकाय च चतुर्थमंशं कररूपेण प्रददति स्म। कर्षकेभ्यो राज्ञे वा प्रायः धान्यानामेव वितरणमभवत्। ये चाल्पीयसो भूभागस्य स्वामिनः ते जनपदेषु द्विविधा अभवन्—स्वयं कर्षणादि कुर्वन्त एके, अपरे च कर्षकद्वारा कारयन्तश्च। ये कर्षक-द्वारा कारयन्ति स्म तेऽपि द्विविधाः—कर्षणादिसामग्रीं वृषभ-हल-बीज-

जलसेचनसाधनादिकां स्वीयामेव कर्षकेभ्यः प्रदाय कृषिं कारयन्त एके, अपरे च कर्षकसम्बन्धिन्यैव सामग्रया कृषिं कारयन्तः। प्रथमे चतुर्थमंशमेवालभन्त, द्वितीये चार्धमंशम्। राज्ञे करप्रदानन्तूभयत्र भूस्वामिनामेव। ये च लेख्यद्वारा भुक्तिरूपेण भूभागमुपभुञ्जते ते भूमिस्वामिभ्यस्तावन्तमेव धान्यराशिं वितरन्ति यावच्च लेख्ये निर्दिष्टम्। करप्रदानन्तु भूस्वामिनामेव।

तत्रापि भूस्वामिनस्सर्वेऽपि जानपदेभ्यः पुरोहित-रजक-नापित-ग्रामरक्षकप्रभृतिभ्यो नियतं कञ्चन भागं धान्यस्य वितरन्ति स्म। अनेन क्रमेण ये भूस्वामिनः, ये च भूभागरहितास्तेषामुभयेषामपि समानो योगः क्षेमश्चाभवताम्। प्रायस्सर्वेऽपि भूस्वामिनः स्वस्वभूभागेभ्यः षष्ठमेवांशं स्वस्वगृहानानयन्ति स्म। तत्र माण्डलिकाः स्वस्वकुटुम्बनिर्वाहाय पर्याप्तं धान्यराशिमवस्थाप्य शिष्टं नगराणि सम्प्रेष्य विक्रीणन्ति स्म। प्रशासकास्तु नागरिकाणां जानपदानाञ्चापत्कालोपयोगाय संगृह्य धान्यराशिं रक्षन्ति स्म। विशेषतश्च जनपदेषु मेषमकरसंक्रमणावसरे प्रायो भूस्वामिनः स्वस्वकृषकेभ्यः रजकनापितादिभ्यश्च वस्त्राण्यपि नियमेन वितरन्ति स्म। प्रशासका अपि बुद्धिजीविनां कुलानि वस्त्रादिप्रदानेन परिपालयाम्बभूवुः। इयञ्च रीतिर्भारते चिरात्प्रवृत्ताऽभवत्। तदानीं सर्व एव सुखसमृद्धा अभवन्। सुखसमृद्धौ--अशनं वसनञ्च प्राधान्येन परिगण्येते। तच्चेदुभयं व्यवस्थितं न तर्हि दुःखस्याव्यवस्थाया वा अवसरः। शास्त्रानतिक्रमणं सर्वैः पर्यपाल्यत। यत्र भूभागे यदीयं स्वं जन्मतस्सिद्धं न तत्रान्यस्याक्रमणमभवत्। सर्वस्वदक्षिणेन यागेन विश्वजिता ईजानो राजापि राज्यसम्बन्धिनीं भूमिं दक्षिणात्वेन दातुं न प्रभवति। यत्र यदीयं सत्वं स एव तद्दातुं विक्रेतुं वा प्रभुर्भवति। राज्ञस्तु राज्ये न स्वत्वमस्ति। विशेषोऽयं जैमिनिना—'न भूमिस्स्यात् सर्वान् प्रत्यविशिष्टत्वात्' (जै० सू०, 6. 7. 3) इति सूत्रयता प्रतिपादितः। अत्र शबरस्वामिनो

भाष्यकारस्य वचनानि समालोचनमर्हन्ति ।[1] राज्ञो राज्यं हि नाम— स्वविषयपरिपालन-कण्टकोद्धरण-भृति-वृत्तित्वेन कर्षकादिभ्यः करादानम्, दण्डेभ्यश्च दण्डादानम् । एतावानेव सम्बन्धो राज्ञः, न तत्र तस्य स्वामित्वम् । तथात्वे वनगततृणकाष्ठादावपि स्वत्वापत्तौ तत्र सत्वोत्पादकपरिक्रयविरोधस्स्यात् । स्वस्वत्वनिवृत्तिपूर्वकपरस्वत्वापादनं दाने यथा, तथैव रिक्थक्रयादीनामपि स्वत्वोत्पादकत्वम् । तस्य विरोधो भवेत् । यद्यपि 'क्षत्रियस्य विजितम्' इति गौतमवचनेन राज्ञो जयस्य स्वत्वोत्पादकत्वमस्ति, तथापि शत्रुस्वामिकधनगृह-क्षेत्रादिविषयकत्वमेव तस्येति न तद्दाने कश्चन प्रत्यूहः । एवञ्च गौतमोक्ता ये स्वत्वोत्पादकास्साधारणा उपायास्ते मनुष्यमात्रसाधारणाः, न तत्र सार्वभौमस्य माण्डलिकस्य साधारणजनतायाश्च कोऽपि विशेष इति जैमिनेराशयस्सिध्यति ।

अतएव दायभागविचारावसरे पूर्वजा विज्ञानेश्वरप्रभृतयः न विभागादनन्तरं स्वत्वमुत्पद्यते, किन्तु स्वत्वस्य सतोऽनन्तरं विभाग इति निर्णीतवन्तः । एतादृशस्वत्वस्य व्यवहारपदे क्वापि न प्रवेशः । किन्तु लेख्यद्वारा भुक्तप्राप्तिर्येषु भूभागेष्वासीत् तत्रैव लेख्योल्लङ्घनजनितस्य व्यवहारस्य पदं न्यायालयेष्वासीत् । तत्रापि स्मृतिकारा भूयसो नियमान् प्रवर्तितवन्तः । एकस्मिन्नेव भूभागे द्विपुरुषं त्रिपुरुषं वा कर्षणादिकार्याणि कुर्वतामपि कृषकाणां स्वत्वं तत्र न स्वीक्रियते, तत्र रिक्थक्रयादीनां स्वत्वोत्पादकानामभावात् । यस्मिंश्च कुले

1. 'न भूमिर्देयेति । कुतः ? क्षेत्राणामिश्रितारो मनुष्या दृश्यन्ते, न कृत्स्नस्य पृथिवीगोलकस्येति । आह—य इदानीं सार्वभौमस्स तर्हि दास्यति । सोऽपि नेति ब्रूमः । कुतः ? यावता भूभागेन सार्वभौमो भूमेरीष्टे तावताऽन्योऽपि । न तत्र कश्चिद्विशेषः । सार्वभौमस्य त्वेतदधिकम्—यदसौ पृथिव्यां सम्भृतानां व्रीह्यादीनां रक्षणेन निर्विष्टस्य कस्यचिद्भागमीष्टे, न भूमेः । तन्निर्विष्टाश्च ये मनुष्याः तैरन्यत्सर्वप्राणिनां धारणचंक्रमणादि यद्भूमिकृतं तत्रेशित्वं प्रति न कश्चिद्विशेषः । तस्मान्न भूमिर्देयेति' ।

साक्षात्परम्परया वा न कोऽपि दायभाक् तादृशो भूभागो राज्ञा प्राप्यते स्म। किन्तु तादृशभूभागग्रहणे राज्ञां महान् सङ्कोच एवादृश्यत। अत्र कविकुललललामस्य कालिदासस्य शाकुन्तलीयं षष्ठाङ्कीयं प्रकरणमुपष्टम्भकम्।[1] एवमादयो नियमाः प्राचीनभारतेऽभवन्। इदमप्यस्माकं प्राचीनानां वैशिष्ट्यम्—यत् स्मृतिग्रन्थेषु निबन्धेषु सदाचारेषु वा सर्वेषु सर्वेषां भारतीयानां समानप्रमाण्याभ्युपगन्तृत्वं नाम। मिथः स्मृतिग्रन्था निबन्धा वा सदाचारा वा कामं विरुध्येरन्। परं मीमांसासिद्धैर्न्यायैरेव ते विरोधाः पूर्वजैः पर्यक्रियन्त। अतएव जैमिनिः कल्पसूत्राधिकरणे 'सर्वत्र च प्रयोगात् सन्निधानशास्त्राच्च' (जै० सू०, 1. 3. 14) इति सूत्रयन्नभिप्रैति—यत्स्मृतिकाराणामपि वचनं श्रुतिविरुद्धं न्यायविरुद्धं वा न प्रमाणमिति। किञ्च न्यायाविरुद्धाः श्रुत्यविरुद्धाश्च ये स्मृतिनिबन्धसदाचाराः, तेषु सर्वेषु वैदिकानां तुल्यैव प्रामाण्यबुद्धिः। अयञ्च न्यायः होलाकाधिकरणसिद्धः। अत्र 'अपि वा सर्वधर्मस्स्यात् तन्न्यायत्वाद्विधानस्य' (जै० सू०, 1. 3. 16) इति जैमिनिसूत्रं तद्भाष्यञ्चानुकूल्यमावहतः। जैमिनिर्महर्षिः विचारकुशलः। सर्वाणि श्रुतिस्मृतिवाक्यानि सुविचार्य निर्णयं करोति। जैमिनिना प्रवर्तितानेव न्यायान् निबन्धकारा यथायथमनुसरन्तः समाजव्यावस्थायां सम्प्रवृत्ताः। प्राचीनानां सामाजिकीं स्थितिमनुशीलयतो मे प्रतिभाति, यत्—वर्णाश्रमसम्प्रदायप्रयुक्तैर्विभिन्नैर्धर्मैर्युक्तानपि मानवान् जीवनयात्रायां तुल्यरूपेणैव सर्वान् नेतुमैच्छन्निति। तेषां मनसि नायमाशय

1. प्रतीहार्योऽमात्यलेखं दुष्यन्ताय दत्ते सति स तमनुवाच्य वदति—'कथं समुद्रव्यवहारी सार्थवाहो धनमित्रो नाम नौव्यसने मृतः? अनपत्यश्च किल तपस्वी। राजगामी तस्यार्थसञ्चयः इत्यमात्येन लिखितम्। वेवति! बहुधनत्वाद्बहुपत्नीकेन तव भवता भवितव्यम्। विचार्यतां यदि काचिदापन्नसत्त्वा तस्य भार्यासु स्यात्'.....'स खलु गर्भः पितुरिक्थमर्हति। गच्छ एवममात्यं ब्रूहि।.....किमनेन सन्ततिरस्ति नास्तीति?

येन येन वियुज्यन्ते प्रजाः स्निग्धेन बन्धुना। स स पापाद्दते तासां दुष्यन्त इति घुष्यताम्'।

उदभूत्, यद्—अधिकभूभागवद्भ्यो भूभागमाच्छिद्य मूसम्पद्रहितेभ्यो भूभागो दातव्य इति। विनैव भुस्वामित्वं लोकानां योगश्च क्षेमश्च यदि ससम्मानं भवेतां न तर्ह्याच्छिद्य दानस्यावसरः। धर्मसंवलितार्थ-कामप्रधानायाः सामाजिकव्यवस्थाया एवेदं फलम्, यत्—अद्यतनेष्विव दिवसेषु तदानीं जनसंख्याविहद्दग्भावः। सामाजिकव्यवस्थायां कुटुम्ब-नियमनमपि खल्वन्तर्भवति। इदानीमेव न तदानीं भ्रूणहत्यादिषु प्रवृत्तिरुदभूल्लोकानाम्। कुटुम्बनियमनेऽपि धर्मग्रन्थास्साध्यमाचरन्ति। अर्थकामावेव प्रधानीकृत्य यदा सामाजिकव्यावस्था भवति तदा धर्मभीतेरभावेनोच्छृङ्खलं लोकानां प्रवृत्तिस्स्वाभाविकी। 'प्रक्षालनाद्धि पङ्कस्य दूरादस्पर्शनं वरम्' इति हि न्यायः। अधुनापि धर्मसंवलिता-वर्थकामौ प्रधानीकृत्य सामाजिकीं व्यावस्थां यदि प्रसारयामः, तर्हि मन्येऽहं भूविषये कदापि भारते नेयं दुर्दशा स्यात् याञ्च वयमधुनाऽनु-भवाम इति।

CENTRAL LIBRARY

PART II

FEUDALISM IN ANCIENT INDIA

Proceedings of the Seminar

Second Day

Date : 19th December, 1964.

Time : 10 A.M. to 1 P.M. and
3 P.M. to 5 P.M.

Place : Asutosh Hall, Calcutta University.

Subject : Feudalism in Ancient India.

President : PROF. R. S. SHARMA, Patna University.

Principal Speaker : DR. S. K. MITRA, Sanskrit College, Calcutta, and Calcutta University.

Participants besides the President and the Principal Speaker :—

1.	DR. B. P. MAZUMDAR	Patna University
2.	DR. S. D. SINGH	Lucknow University
3.	DR. B. N. SINGH YADAVA	Allahabad University
4.	DR. LALLANJI GOPAL	Banaras Hindu University
5.	DR. H. V. S. MURTHY	Gauhati University
6.	DR. S. B. CHAUDHURI	Burdwan University
7.	DR. S. K. MAITI	Jadavpur University
8.	PROF. N. R. RAY	Calcutta University
9.	PROF. D. C. SIRCAR	Calcutta University
10.	PROF. S. K. SARASWATI	Victoria Memorial, Calcutta
11.	SRI D. MUKHERJI	Calcutta University
12.	SRI S. SARKAR	Calcutta University
13.	DR. B. DEY	Burdwan University
14.	SRI D. BISWAS	Presidency College, Calcutta, and Calcutta University
15.	DR. A. TRIPATHI	Presidency College, Calcutta, and Calcutta University
16.	DR. H. N. CHATTERJEE	Sanskrit College, Calcutta
17.	SRI H. C. NEOGI	Sanskrit College, Calcutta
18.	DR. S. BANERJEE	Research Fellow, Calcutta University

Reporters : DR. SATYARANJAN BANERJEE and SRI DILIP KUMAR NAG

Morning Session

The session started at 10 A.M. when Dr. S. K. Mitra read his paper on 'Feudalism in Ancient India'. Professor Sharma thanked Dr. Mitra for his paper and then invited other scholars to read their papers.

Prof. D. C. Sircar and Dr. B. P. Mazumdar read their papers respectively on 'Landlordism confused with Feudalism' and 'Merchants and Landed Aristocracy' in Ancient India.

Prof. Sharma thanked both the scholars and asked the house to take part in the discussion.

The first question taken up was the definition of the term 'feudalism'.

Sri D. Mukherjee suggested that 'Feudalism' generally implies a system of holding land by means of military tenure, and hence it involves a kind of military service.

But Prof. Sharma thought that this definition of 'feudalism' is not fully correct, because feudalism as prevalent in Russia in the 18th and 19th centuries had practically no military obligation.

Dr. Lallanji Gopal said that, since there is no uniform system of feudalism, we can use the term even if all the conditions of feudalism are not satisfied.

Prof. D. C. Sircar disagreed with Prof. Sharma and Dr. Gopal and pointed out that there can be no feudalism without some essential conditions and that land grants were generally made by ancient Indian kings in favour of the priestly class only for religious merit and fame and not with any condition attached to them. In his opinion, in ancient India, there was landlordism but no feudalism.

Prof. Ray said that in order to have a clear conception of 'feudalism', we should distinctly define the terms, 'landlordism' and 'feudalism'. In Professor Ray's opinion—

(1) The word 'feudal' is derived from the Latin word *feudālis* which means pertaining to a *feud* or fief indicative of the nature of a *feud* (not hostility) which is synonymous with fee. And hence this fee should certainly be paid by people in general and not by tenants in particular.

(2) A landlord is the owner of a land, the person who is correlated with the tenants or rent-payers. Hence there must be a difference between a king and a landlord. Even Shakespeare (in the 16th century) distinguished a landlord from a king :

'Landlord of England art thou now, not king.'

(*Richard the Second*, II. I. 113)

Prof. Ray also thought that by the term 'feudalism' we should not understand military obligations exclusively. He continued that, so far as the relations of tenants with the land are concerned, there are various obligations, e.g., (i) military, (ii) political or (iii) economic. In his opinion, the obligations differ from country to country, e.g., the French from the Dutch, the German from the British, the British from the Russian ; but the basis, in all the cases, is the land.

Prof. Sharma then said that it is very difficult to define the exact connotation of the term. There is not much difference between landlordism and feudalism, he said. According to him, the essence of feudalism is the dependence of the tillers of land on the king or the state in respect of land. He pointed out that self-sufficiency in a country's economy is an essential condition of feudalism. He then referred to the village economy of ancient India and opined that the peasantry in that condition had something to do with feudalism.

Prof. Sharma then referred to Prof. D. C. Sircar's paper and invited discussion on the question whether obligations in a feudal society are necessary.

Prof. Sircar observed that, in a land under the feudal system, there must be some obligations of the tenants to the king. But, he said, we have hundreds of Indian charters of different periods, but not a single one of them making an explicit mention of any kind of obligations of the feudal nature.

Prof. Ray pointed out that, if we can establish a hierarchy from top to bottom, there must be some sort of obligation. The very nature of hierarchy, he said, is

a kind of obligation, that is to say, hierarchy presupposes obligation. Hence, in his opinion, there is some kind of obligations and it may be mutual obligation.

Referring to Dr. Sircar's observation, Prof. S. K. Saraswati stated that, although the charters do not mention any kind of obligation clearly, still there must be some sort of inherent obligations on the part of the donee.

But Prof. Sircar pointed out that the majority of the charters are emphatic on the point that the grants were made unconditionally and that, even when in a few cases certain conditions are specified, they are never of the feudal type. In this connection, he drew attention to the condition that the gift land would be confiscated if the donee rebelled against the king, as we find recorded in a Vākāṭaka inscription.

Prof. Sharma observed that, whether feudalism is concerned with military services or with the peasantry or with mutual settlement, in all these cases, obligation is the main headway, because obligations in any society are necessary to realise economic and political development. In support of his argument, he referred to the *Dharmaśāstras* wherein the obligations of the Brāhmaṇas, the Kṣatriyas and the Vaiśyas are distinctly stated. He emphasised that the main duty of a Brāhmaṇa is the upholding of the *varṇāśrama*. Hence it is not unwise to conclude, he said, that the various systems were introduced only to stabilise the social and political order of the country.

With reference to Prof. Sharma's points, Prof. Sircar raised two objections :

First, in the *Dharmaśāstras*, the duties of a Brāhmaṇa are enumerated as (i) *yajana*, (ii) *yājana*, (iii) *adhyayana*, (iv) *adhyāpana*, etc., and nowhere it is stated that the Brāhmaṇas are the upholders of the *varṇāśrama* order, the maintenance of the order being the king's responsibility.

Secondly, if the feudal system was prevalent in ancient India, the king would have created big estates for his vassals with specific mention of the conditions under which

the estates should be enjoyed. But, he said, there is no such thing in Indian epigraphy.

Prof. Ray then asked whether the designation *Mahā-sāmanta*, often found in inscriptions, convey any special significance.

Dr. Sircar stated that a *Mahāsāmanta* could have worked in different capacities, but that no obligations of the feudal type are usually mentioned in their connection in the epigraphic records.

The house then concluded the discussion on the above topic and turned to the question of 'Pre-Gupta Origin of Feudalism'.

Dr. S. K. Mitra expressed the opinion that certain passages of early Indian texts suggest some sort of hold of the donor over the donee.

Prof. Ray referred to the Scythian contribution to the administration of this country. The Scythians, a nomadic tribe of Central Asia, regarded the cattle to be the basis of their property. They had no kind of land system, but a kind of hierarchy. Many of their political and social ideas were introduced in India ; as for instance, the use of the term *pārada*. According to Prof. Ray, the use of the titles *Śāhi*, *Śāhānuśāhi*, etc., points to a hierarchy from the begining of the Christian era.

Prof. Sharma agreed with Prof. Ray and observed that the use of expressions like *Mahārāja* and *Rājan* side by side may signify the rule of the greater over the smaller.

But Prof. Saraswati and Sri D. Mukherjee disagreed with Prof. Sharma on the ground that the Vedic literature speaks of *Cakravartin*, *Mahārāja*, *Ekarāṭ*, etc., to signify the king himself and not to mean 'the king of kings'. Prof. Sircar disagreed with Prof. Ray and others. He pointed out that *Śāhi* and *Śāhānuśāhi* are Iranian titles borrowed by the Scythians and that feudalism cannot be favoured by a nomadic tribe since the basis of the system is said to be land.

Prof. Ray agreed with Prof. Saraswati and Sri D. Mukherjee and said that, before the Christian era, there was no hierarchy in India, but that, the terms which were

cited being different, the question of gradation does not arise. If the designations be the same and an affix is put before it, it denotes gradation and indicates a system of hierarchy.

The house then discussed the nature of land grants.

Prof. Sharma said that, whenever a village was granted to a donee, the artisans, villagers and tillers of the land were also transferred along with the village. Moreover, the king had the right to bind down the villagers to the land.

Prof. Sircar disagreed with Prof. Sharma and said that the king had no right to bind down the villagers, unless they were slaves, and that there is no epigraphic evidence to prove the contrary, though this evidence has been sometimes misunderstood.

After the above discussion Dr. B. Dey raised the question whether feudalism has anything to do with the agricultural or industrial production of the country.

Prof. Ray stated that the *Jātakas* which were written in the 4th century A.D. deal with different forms of apprenticeship, specialisation in crafts, etc., which have something to do with the socio-economic system of the country.

Dr. Mazumdar said that there are numerous inscriptions which prove the development of iron and steel industries between the 8th and 15th centuries A.D.

Prof. Sharma concluded the discussion by referring to the *Harṣacarita* in which the sytem of agriculture is clearly explained. This was followed by the lunch recess for two hours (from 1 P.M. to 3 P.M.).

Afternoon Session

The evening session commenced at 3 P.M. with a paper on 'Origin of Feudalism in Ancient India' by Sri Haran Chandra Neogi.

Referring to Sri Neogi's paper, Dr. S. Banerjee raised the following questions:

(1) What is Sri Neogi's source for the statement that Aśoka's policy of non-aggression stopped the supply of slaves ?

(2) Did Aśoka issue any decree for the betterment of the slaves only ? Is there any edict of Aśoka dealing specifically with the betterment of slaves ?

Prof. Ray and Prof. Sircar said that there is no positive evidence to show that Aśoka's policy of non-aggression stopped the supply of slaves.

Dr. H. Chatterjee suggested that the origin of feudalism in India can be traced back to the period of Manu. He quoted the *Manusaṁhitā*, VII, verses 115-119, wherein *Īśa* and *Adhipati* are frequently mentioned. These designations are, according to Dr. Chatterjee, certainly related with feudalism.

Prof. Sircar did not agree with Dr. Chatterjee and pointed out that the verses of the *Manusaṁhitā* refer to the king's governors of different grades, viz. the lord of 1 village, that of 10 villages, that of 20 villages, that of 100 villages and that of 1000 villages who enjoyed respectively the royal dues collected from the village in question, the free holding of 1 *kula* of land, that of 5 *kulas* of land, the *jāgīr* of 1 village and that of 1 township.

Dr. S. K. Mitra wanted to know whether there is any literary text which refers to the feudal rights.

Dr. Gopal then referred to the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* wherein mention is made of feudal rights. Prof. Sharma too mentioned Bāṇa's *Kādambarī* and the *Harṣacarita* and Varāhamihira's *Bṛhatsaṁhitā* wherein expressions like *Sāmanta*, *Bhogīna*, etc., are explained. Prof. Sircar did not agree with the views of Dr. Gopal and Prof. Sharma.

Then there was a discussion on the question whether any religious movement in ancient India was associated with the *Sāmanta* or Feudal System.

Sri D. Biswas and Sri D. Mukherjee said that the religious movements were independent.

Agreeing with Sri Biswas and Sri Mukherjee, Prof. Ray pointed out that feudalism is the symptom of a society and that the entire attitude after the 6th or 7th century A.D. was mediaeval particularly in social attitude. He said that

the cults were divided into sub-cults and the works of creative genius ceased to be produced. In his opinion, there is hardly any creative classic after Kālidāsa and from the 7th to the 16th century, there was a complete stagnation in Indian literature. But, on Prof. Sircar pointing to Bhavabhūti (8th century) and Śaṅkara (9th century), Prof. Ray admitted that Śaṅkara is the last creative giant of ancient India. He observed that proliferations of sects, gods and goddesses, which can be proved from a close study of iconography, are the characteristics of mediaevalism.

The house then discussed some points relating to the prevalence of coins in medieval India.

Prof. Sircar was of opinion that there was no dearth of coins in the markets of early medieval India. Gold, silver and copper coins have been discovered in large numbers and such coins are mentioned in hundreds of inscriptions. Moreover when some coins were introduced in the Indian market, they remained in circulation for centuries. The cowries were also abundantly used as money. The *Rājataraṅgiṇī* speaks of the abundant use of cowries called *Dinnāra* in ancient Kashmir.

Prof. Ray observed that, if we find the mention of *dīnāra* or *dramma* in an inscription, we need not assume that they are gold coins, nor from the reference to *rūpaka* can we take it to be silver. Finds of coins by themselves also do not suggest anything. International trade cannot be carried on without gold.

While mentioning that epigraphic references are often specifically to coins of gold and silver, Prof. Sircar disagreed with the views of Prof. Ray. He further pointed out that, although we had no gold coins in the earlier period, the Romans brought gold coins to India. Gold coins were not necessary for the Indians, he pointed out, to maintain favourable commercial relations with the Romans.

Prof. Ray continued to point out that the Kuṣāna gold for coins was certainly introduced in India from outside and it is due to the accumulation of gold that Somnath was plundered. Dr. S. D. Singh agreed with Dr. Ray and

referred to the gold images of gods in South India. The temples were attacked, according to him, only for the purpose of plundering gold. In Prof. Sircar's opinion, such accumulation of gold was a sign of the prosperity of India in the early medieval period.

Then Dr. Maiti wanted to know whether cowries were accepted as state coins.

Prof. Sircar replied that, not only cowries, even lumps of metal and coins belonging to different parts of the world were accepted as money in the Indian markets. In his opinion, they were as good as the state coins and cowries are known to have been used in State transaction at least in Bengal and Kashmir.

Dr. Mazumdar pointed out that, in political economy, land was less important than commerce.

Referring to Dr. Mazumdar's point, Prof. Sircar observed that, in South India, there are numerous references to the flourishing guilds of merchants called *Svadeśi* and *Paradeśi*, who played a dominant part in the economy of the country.

Then Sri S. Sarkar gave his wiews on the nature of feudalism on the basis of Marc Bloch's celebrated work on the subject. He pointed out that dependent pesantry is one of the main characteristics of feudalism and supposed that, even before the Guptas, the condition of the peasantry in India was not better. Hence, in his opinion, feudalism in India may have started from the beginning of the Christian era.

Prof. Sircar did not agree with this view.

Prof. Sharma concluded the session by enumerating the questions discussed as follows :—

(i) Definition of Feudalism by various speakers—its precise definition being difficult.

(ii) Origin of Feudalism.

(iii) Nature of Feudalism.

(iv) Relation of production with Feudalism.

(v) Importance of gold coins in the field of International trade and commerce,

(vi) Existence of guilds in South India.

(vii) System of agriculture as indicated by the *Harṣacarita*.

(viii) Growth of industries as indicated by inscriptions.

(ix) Religious Movements and the Feudal System.

(x) Mediaeval Religion and Iconography.

Prof. Ray then extended his heartiest thanks to the delegates of the different universities for their participation in the seminars.

He specially thanked Prof. D. C. Sircar, Prof. S. K. Saraswati, Dr. S. K. Mitra and also his other colleagues, not only for their participation in the seminars but also for their sincere co-operation. Thanks were also extended by him to all the scholars who attended the seminars and made it a success. Lastly he thanked Prof. Sharma who took the trouble of conducting the deliberations in the seminars.

Dr. Maiti then thanked, on behalf of the delegates of the different universities, the President, the speakers and all the scholars who graced the seminar by their participation.

The session closed at 5 P.M.

Reported by—

Dr. Satyaranjan Banerjee and
Sri Dilipkumar Nag

CENTRAL LIBRARY

I

Feudalism in Ancient India

S. K. Mitra,

Sanskrit College, Calcutta, and Calcutta University

It is a matter of great pleasure to me to be able to welcome you, learned scholars, to this symposium organised by the Centre of Advanced Study in Ancient Indian History and Culture. The topic for discussion today as determined by the authorities and as already circulated is "Feudalism in Ancient India". It is indeed a controversial topic on which divergent views are often expressed by scholars. The learned discourses delivered by our guest Professor Dr. R. S. Sharma during the last few days no doubt throw illuminating light on the subject. We are thankful to him for his researches in the field. But still we have this symposium today. This means that there is further scope for discussion of the subject and in a symposium like this scholars assembled may have an exchange of their viewpoints and we can expect concrete results in the field of historiography.

R. S. Sharma, it may be mentioned, surveyed the economic and political conditions obtaining in India to trace his subject from 300 to 1200 A.D. It must be admitted that the learned scholar presented a lot of informations straining through his analytical assessment. But, as is well known, no system, far less a socio-economic system of the type we are seized with at present, would take its rise on a fixed date. Rather such a rise, if at all, must be preceded by a long evolutionary process of socio-economic changes leading to the development of circumstances suitable for it to come about. In that case there might have been scope for investigation of the social and economic factors of the earlier period. This was of course beyond the purview of the present series of lectures of our learned scholar. But this is a desideratum on which I would like to invite the attention of scholars here.

Now, about the definition of the term Feudalism, it is pretty well known that there is a wide variety of opinions and theories about the system known to have existed in Europe. Conditions in Europe had been different in different countries; but there have been some common features which justify the European historians the use of a common expression to apply to the varying conditions. In determining the essence of feudalism a constitutional historian would generally take land-holding to be the source of political power, a sociologist would focus on status as determined by tenure, and to an economic historian it is primarily a mode of production by the exercise of rights over persons. This "right" has been described by Prof. P. Struve as "a contractual but indissoluble bond between service and land-grant, between personal obligation and real right". That is to say, the crux of the definition lies in the socio-economic content of the "obligation" which connects the direct producer and his immediate superior or overlord. Thus it will be appreciated that the economic interpretation of the system reveals the most important aspect of it.

So the question is whether in India we know sufficiently well the social and economic factors obtaining during the period reviewed, which may enable us to study sysematically the presence of conditions as existing in Europe.

Of course, landed estates were owned by powerful elements of polity and society. But we must remember that according to certain authorities the king was the ultimate owner of land. This view however is not shared by all. The rents and taxes to which the king was entitled are mentioned in the different sources relating to this period in the legal texts, inscriptions, land-grants, etc. It appears that the list of rents and taxes is indeed important as it shows the sources of royal revenue. Sometimes the king in making a grant forgoes these rents and taxes in favour of the grantee. The question would then arise, whether the grantee in such circumstances can impose further levies on the actual producer. We do not know if

sufficient light is available on the subject. In any case there appears to have been some limit beyond which the owner of the estate, even the king, could hardly go. To that extent therefore rights are controlled.

If conditions are made very strict in law for the peasantry or other producers and they perforce have to remain confined to their respective regions or estates and free movement of labour is thereby restricted, this will no doubt encourage the development of a situation where the owner of the estates can make exactions with impunity. But even then we must say that if at all there was any kind of feudalism in our country it is doubtful whether the excesses associated with the system in Europe could have found a fruitful soil here. Rather the more the contractual form developed the greater was the likelihood of the country being free from excessive feudal obligations.

If the polity was weak and was unable to enforce obedience to law, the producer in both agricultural and industrial fields could not be in a position to defend their rights provided in law. In such circumstances a situation might arise which would intensify the rigours of feudalism. But it has to be actually traced from positive evidences.

In the industrial sector there was the organisation of the producers on a guild basis, which gave an assurance of strength and solidarity among them. They could surely resist extortionary demands, if they were sufficiently strong and well organised.

The system of polity generally prevalent in this period shows a king who rules the remoter parts of his territory with the help of local lords (*Sāmantas*). If the king is strong he can keep the local magnates under proper control. If, on the other hand, he is weak, he is either replaced or there is a general confusion that can give some scope to these lords to be extortionate. At the same time, in view of the plentiful evidence showing warlike conditions existing throughout the country, a king to meet his military needs may also put pressure on the local magnates for payment of higher tributes than ordinarily fixed in the economy of

relationship between the king and the local lord. The nature and extent of control of the local lord over the land placed under his charge are not definitely known from the evidences at our disposal. Sometimes, as far as we know, a *Sāmanta* or regional lord might make a grant of land under his personal authority. In such circumstances the control was real and authoritative. But in some other cases, it is observed that the approval of the king was deemed necessary, which may go to show that the control was limited.

If there was any trace of feudalism in ancient India, it must have been of a modified sort and strictly regulated by conditions obtaining in different regions of our country. In spite of basic sameness in some of its features, it must be admitted that there had been enough local variations. These local variations must have to be studied both extensively and intensively in order that the problem can be viewed in proper perspective in all its facets.

In order to facilitate discussion at this symposium I would crave your indulgence to place before this intellectual assembly a few broad points bearing on possible existence or otherwise of feudalism in the ancient period of Indian history.

1. I have already mentioned that anticipation of feudalism or development of feudal conditions in India, if any, should be traced to the pre-Gupta period, if not earlier. A thorough scientific examination of literary and epigraphic data may enlighten us about the relationship subsisting in the country between the producer and the owner as well as between different stages of administrative or political hierarchy. A Sātavāhana record (Myakadoni inscription, Bellary Dist.) refers to a village owned by a *Gaulmika* included in the *āhāra* of a superior officer (a *Mahā-senāpati*) ; it may appear that certain features of feudalism may have existed in Southern India (Deccan) in the early centuries of the Christian era. Have we got similar evidences from any part of Northern India or any other part of the country ?

In this connection, I believe it would also be worthwhile to study whether the system and its development in India had anything to do with the foreign elements which came into India and established themselves as ruling power for some centuries in pre-Christian times, viz., the Imperial Parthians, Scythians, Indo-Parthians, etc.

2. In regard to beneficiaries, to whom benefices were granted, have we enough data to determine their exact liabilities to the king, specially when these donees were Brāhmaṇa priests and scholars ? The Church in Europe was an organisation with its ramifications spread over in different parts of the country, while in India priests did not combine to form an organisation for religious services. If the Church was a factor in European feudalism how could the Indian priesthood in this land of different religions existing side by side could be a part of feudal order ?

3. What was the nature of the socio-economic hierarchy associated with land holding in India if it was an essential part of the feudal system supposed to have existed in the ancient period ?

4. It will surely be admitted that the production technique in India, either agricultural or industrial, was not developed, and the level was possibly low. Information as regards developments in European history on the otherhand is adequate enough to form the basis of a critical survey ; but is it possible to come to any definite conclusion regarding the connection between production and feudal growth with the help of materials needed for a suitable survey ?

5. If I have understood Prof. Sharma aright, he seems to be of the opinion that trade languished in the post-Gupta period, which he connected with the development of feudal conditions. At the same time he has attempted to show the evolution of feudalism in the earlier period when trade was certainly in a flourishing condition over a considerable period. What then is the meaning of feudalism being connected with trade, irrespective of its phases ? A further clarification of this point would be of much help to us.

6. If the economic picture of the post-Gupta period

became so gloomy that India was divided into entities of exclusive and self-sufficient villages since 750 A.D., this will inevitably imply a condition characterised by stoppage of all active communication even between the component parts of any territory or kingdom. Is there sufficient evidence to show that market system completely collapsed during this period ? How could then we cxplain the occurrences of important ports like Cheymur, Daibal, etc., in the accounts of Muslim writers ? What about India's trade with South-East Asia ? What might have been the motive of the Cola rulers to "turn the Bay of Bengal into a Cola lake", to use the words of Dr. H. C. Raychaudhuri ?

7. Will all scholars agree with the view that absence of coin finds is a positive evidence of the non-existence of currency ? Can it not be shown that there may have been a barter system in support of the economy based on money tokens, which may have fulfilled the requirements of trade connections ? We may allude to frequent references to *kākanikā* and *dramma* in Bengal inscriptions though none of them could have been traced. It may be that these money tokens formed an ingot currency which might have freely circulated beyond the barriers of any particular kingdom. Similarly the Siyadoni inscription mentions various types of coins untraceable in excavations.

8. It appears to me rather intriguing that the rich vocabulary of Sanskrit language does not give us any expression which convey the idea analogous to the term feudalism. The word *Sāmanta* bears only a partial description of the system, if at all. Would it not then be more profitable for us to study in detail the evidence which we have for each age regarding economic conditions than to start with the idea that something which grew elsewhere under different conditions had also a natural soil in this country ? It has not been possible to fix the character of feudalism even in the different countries of Europe, where it has been traced. If the emphasis of our enquiry is on the study of the system or systems which passed through different phases in the course of many centuries of India's

early history, would that not be more useful even from the point of view of a comparative estimate ?

II

Landlordism Confused with Feudalism

D. C. Sircar, Calcutta University

With the exception of certain late medieval records of Vijayanagara speaking of the *Amara* tenure involving enjoyment of royal land by persons on the condition of supplying soldiers to the king or landlord when necessary, there is no trace, in ancient and medieval India, of any tenure even remotely resembling any aspect of the socio-economic system called feudalism that was prevalent in much of Western Europe in the Middle Ages. But some writers are inclined to confuse Indian landlordism with European feudalism. They should note that even the *Amara-nāyakas* of Vijayanagara were not tied to the soil in the feudal sense.

In the feudal system of Europe, the king was regarded as the holder of all the land of the kingdom, much of the land being let out by him to the barons or tenants-in-chief who, in return for the land, agreed to perform certain services for the king and were under the obligation of making some payments and supplies on occasions. They had usually to provide the king with specificd number of soldiers in times of war. The barons, in their turn, let out land to others on similar conditions, and thus the process was continued down the scale. When a tenant died, it was usual for his successor to pay a fine to the overlord before he could succeed to his estate. Fines were also paid when the tenant sold or gave any part of his land to a stranger. Payments and supplies of articles had again to be made to the master on other recognised occasions such as the knighting of the latter's eldest son and the marriage of his eldest daughter and when he himself required to pay ransom. None of these

characteristic features is especially noticed in the landlordism known from the ancient and early medieval records of India.

In India, the king's ownership of all land was only theoretical at least in respect of land under the possession of permanent tenants whose property could not be confiscated by the king. There is evidence to show that the king often purchased plots of land under permanent tenants in order to obtain proprietary right over them.

The majority of the numerous charters discovered all over the country record grants of land to gods and Brāhmaṇas without stipulating any obligation of the donees to the donors. Obviously, the priestly class was the most unsuitable for rendering services of the feudal type. On the other hand, it is generally stated in the grants in clear terms that the donees were exempted from all kinds of obligations including the supply of unpaid labour. In some cases, it is stated that the donees were entitled to sell and mortgage the donated land. It is significant that not even a single charter records the creation of a great baron. The charters generally created small privileged estates.

The object of the grants is often clearly stated in the charters. It was the desire of attaining religious merit by the donors and their parents. There are only a few early Indian charters recording grants of land to people of the warrior class, sometimes for services rendered to the king. But there is absolutely no mention of obligations of the feudal type even in such records.

The successors of the donees of free holdings were not required to pay any money or offer any presents to the king, and it is often mentioned that the estate would automatically pass to the donees' heirs.

In the feudal system, the man who held land from another was considered to be the dependant and subordinate of the latter. But, in India, the social position of the Brāhmaṇa donees and the temple authorities was exceptionally high, and they were not looked upon as the king's vassals.

It is sometimes supposed that feudalism involving the payment for services in land instead of money developed

in an economy characterised by dearth of coins and absence of trade and that India also exhibited the same characteristics after the fall of the Guptas in the 6th century A.D. Nothing can be more erroneous.

Of course, early Indian rulers often granted *jā'gīrs* for the maintenance of their officers and dependants. But the latter were not under the feudal type of obligations, and there was always plenty of coins in the market. A large number of kings and other agencies belonging to the post-Gupta periods issued coins, and such coins have been discovered in all parts of the country. Moreover, numerous records, both literary and epigraphical, mention various coins of gold, silver and copper prevalent in those days, e.g., *purāṇa* (also called *kārṣāpaṇa, dharaṇa, dramma, rūpaka* and *cūrṇī*), *dīnāra, niṣka* or *suvarṇa, kaḷañju, accu, varāha, māḍa, gadyāṇa*, etc., etc. Over and above these, there was never any real dearth of cowrie-shells which were extensively used as coined money in India in the Gupta and post-Gupta ages. The *Rājataraṅgiṇī* often speaks of payment of salaries in cowrie-shells, the word used for it being *dinnāra.*

It has of course to be admitted that many of the rulers and ruling families of the early and medieval ages do not appear to have issued coins. But the reason apparently is that the kings and the traders did not feel any necessity for fresh coins owing to the plenty of old coins and also of cowrie-shells in the market. There is enough evidence to show that coins once circulated in the market never went out of use in early and medieval India, and cowries were there to make up the scarcity even if coins were not occasionally available in particular areas for some reason or other. In the 5th century A.D., Buddhaghoṣa mentions the *kārṣāpaṇas* issued by Rudradāman I in the 2nd century A.D. as current coins, while the Anjaneri plates of the 8th century refers to the currency of the *rūpakas* issued by Kalacuri Kṛṣṇarāja in the 6th century. Even during the Muslim rule, coins of all ages and countries were current in the Indian market.

There is again some reason to believe that the right

to mint coins was usually leased to the goldsmiths who made coins according to the demand of the traders and bankers, and that it was these latter who determined whether they required more coins at a particular time. They had to pay a commission for getting their bullion minted into coins. Buddhaghoṣa's writings suggest that silver punch-marked coins were manufactured as late as the 5th century A.D. apparently by private agencies.

Flourishing internal trade is indicated by the discovery of hoards of coins of one part of the country in another, as in the case of the Petluripalem (Guntur Dist.) find of Śaka coins. As regards foreign trade and commerce, India's contact with the Arabs by sea and with the Chinese by both land and sea, in the post-Gupta periods, is well established. The Arabs were already in the possession of Sind about the beginning of the 8th century, and we know of Arab officers in the service of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and the Kadambas as well as of Arab settlements at Cambay and Veraval, both in the present Gujarat State. The Veraval inscription of Arjuna points to brisk trade between Gujrat and ports like Ormuz on the Persian Gulf. The Buddhist missionaries travelled from India to China and from China to India along the trade routes and often in merchants' vessels. A number of Indian kings sent embassies to the Chinese imperial court and also received the Chinese emperors' ambassadors. The relations, friendly or hostile, between the Śailendras of Malaysia and Indonesia and the Pālas and Coḷas of India presuppose brisk maritime trade between India and the lands beyond the Bay of Bengal as far as China. The shortness of the period between the application of the name of the Śakas to the era of 78 A.D. in India and the beginning of the use of the 'Śaka era' in Indonesia and Indochina points to very close relation of those lands with the West Indian ports during the rule of the Cālukyas of Bādāmi. Indian scholars at the courts of South-East Asian kings must have travelled from their countries in merchants' vessels.

The wealth exacted by the early Muslim invaders from

the defeated Indian kings and the plundered temples as well as the high salaries in cash paid by the Kashmir kings to their officers (one lakh *dinnāras* paid by Jayāpīḍa daily to his court Pandit and 1½ lakhs and 80000 by Ananta daily to two of his officers) undoubtedly point to the great prosperity of the country, which must have been due, at least partially, to flourishing internal and external trade. As regards internal trade, we may also refer to the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* indicating Kashmir's commercial relations with Malwa and the Deccan in the 11th century, while India's contact with the Arab world and with China (by both sea and land) and the countries beyond the Bay of Bengal can be easily proved as alreay noted.

It is sometimes supposed that the king or landlord had often right over the person of the tenants who were tied to the soil in more or less the feudal sense. This view appears to be wrong. 'To give a village' is really the same as 'to give a village along with the villagers' which means that the king's rent-paying subjects in the village should henceforth pay taxes to the donee. Indeed the grant of a village without giving the donee the power of tax collection from the inhabitants was never meant by any early Indian document. As regards the occasional mention of the gift of a village together with this or that person or class of people, the reference to vintners, etc., being attached to the village, no doubt mean that the revenue income from particular classes was State monopoly in some areas exactly as the income from mango and some other trees. Professionals like the priests, barbers, carpenters, washermen, etc., often enjoyed state land or common village land on the condition of offering their services regularly to the villagers, and such people could be attached to a grant without the State having any right over their person. Some of the attached persons were no doubt slaves. But agriculturist householders attached to a grant must have been enjoying State land or favours for working in the State farms or for ploughing State land on the condition of receiving a share of the crops. Such people were free from

their obligations as soon as they gave up the enjoyment of the State land or favours. Particular merchants of different markets were often attached to a gift village by the Eastern Gaṅga kings apparently because the king was willing to augment the donee's income by transferring his revenue income from them in favour of the donee. Often people of one State migrated to and settled in another, so that tenants were never tied to the land in India as in the European feudal system.

Feudalism is thus a misnomer in the early Indian context.

III

Merchants and Landed Aristocracy in the Feudal Economy of Northern India (8th to 12th Century A.D.)

B. P. Mazumdar, Patna University

The disintegration of the Gupta empire coincided with the rise of a number of independent powers and disturbed political economy. The classical tenor of life ended and fresh movements ushered in a new age both in the political and socio-economic history of India. Early medieval inscriptions acquaint us with a number of Brāhmaṇas, poets and artisans who left their original homes in search of fortune and received grants of land from the rulers or their feudatories in their new environments. Bengal poets like Śaktisvāmin, Lakṣmīdhara, Madana and Gadādhara went to the courts of the Paramāra and Candella kings and of Lalitāditya of Kashmir. They wrote dramas, poems and *praśastis* in their new environment. Bilhaṇa, a native of Kashmir, became the court-poet of the Cālukya monarch Vikramāditya VI. The Brāhmaṇas of Uttar Pradesh, Gauḍa and South India received grants of many tax-free lands from the kings and feudatories of Madhya Pradesh,

Andhra and Orissa.[1] Many Gauḍa Karaṇa-kāyasthas wrote inscriptions of the Candella, Cāhamāna and Kalacuri kings. Some of those inscriptions, e.g. Khajuraho (954 A.D.), Nādol (1141 A.D.) and Delhi-Siwalik (1163), throw considerable light on the then political and socio-economic history and local administration.[2] Similarly, the Māthurānvaya and the Vālabhya Kāyasthas wrote the charters of the Cāhaṃāna and Paramāra kings.[3] In short, early medieval epigraphs refer to large-scale migration in the post-Gupta period. The medieval period was not only an age of feudalism but also the age of mobility of intellectual people on a large scale.

Amongst those personages who left their ancestral homes in search of better prospect, the movement of military leaders and their soldiers caused significant changes in the politico-economic set-up. Bengal and Bihar possibly proved to be the most favourable and lucrative areas for those adventurers. Dr. D. C. Sircar has rightly shown that the number of mercenaries from different parts of India went on increasing in the Pāla army. The Nalanda plate of Dharmapāla mentions mercenary soldiers, who not only belonged to Gauḍa, but also were Mālavas, Khaśas, Kulikas and Hūṇas.[4] Inscriptions of the times from Devapāla to Vigrahapāla III add the names of Karnāṭas and Lāṭas to the list (vide Monghyr, Bhagalpur and Bangaon copper-plates). The Manahali plate of Madanapāla (1144-61 A.D.) further adds the name of the Coḍas.[5] Besides these soldiers, the names of war-lords like Sāmantasena and Nānyadeva (c. 1097-1147 A.D.) who established themselves in Bengal and Bihar, came from the Karṇāṭa country. The Belāva plate of Bhojavarman tells us that the Varmans originally came from Siṁhapura and Vajravarman was

1. *Hist. of Bengal*, Vol. I, pp. 686-687 ; Mazumdar, *Socio-Economic History of Northern India*, pp. 99-100.
2. *Hist. of Bengal*, Vol. I, p. 688.
3. Mazumdar, *op. cit.*, p. 101.
4. *EI*, Vol. XXIII, p. 291.
5. Maitreya, *Gauḍalekhamālā*, p. 153.

"the welfare (incarnate) of the victorious war expedition of the Yādava armies".[1] Siṁhapura is not in Bengal. Dr. R. C. Majumdar suggests a probable location of this place in Kaliṅga.[2] The Rāmpāl copper-plate of Śrīcandra informs us that his great-grandfather Pūrṇacandra was a ruler of Rohitāgiri which has been identified by some scholars with Rohtasgarh in the Shahabad District, Bihar.[3] The ancestors of Ḍommaṇapāla, an independent chief of Pūrvakhāṭikā, in the Sunderbans, are described in an inscription dated 1196 A.D. as having migrated from Ayodhyā.[4]

South Bihar, with its hills and river valleys, also attracted many outsiders. The Dudhpani rock-inscription of the 8th century and the Govindapur stone inscription of 1137-38 A.D. taken together tell us of the Māna rulers of Western Gaya and North Hazaribagh. The founders of this dynasty, Udayamāna and his two brothers, were originally merchants engaged in trade between Ayodhyā and Tāmralipti. The Ujjainiyā Rajputs also travelled from Malwa and established themselves as a political power in the Bhojpur-Dumraon region in Shahabad in the fourteenth century A.D. In that locality ruled Pratāpadhavala and his successors (inscrs. dated 1159 and 1169 A.D.) in the second half of the twelfth century. Wherefrom they hailed is not known ; but *Mahāmāṇḍalika* Udayarāja, a feudatory of Indradhavala, is described in the Sone East Bank copper-plate as belonging to the Kadamba-kula.[5] The Kadambas of Kaliṅga and their overlords the Gaṅgas, came from the Karṇāṭaka country to Ganjam. Besides these families of Karṇāṭa origin, Dr. D. C. Sircar has traced numerous other Karṇāṭis

1. *Inscriptions of Bengal*, Vol. III, p. 19, verses 5 and 6.
2. *Hist. of Bengal*, I, p. 198.
3. This location has not been accepted by R. C. Majumdar who observes in *HB*, Vol. I, p. 194, that "it is more reasonable to hold that Rohitāgiri...was somewhere in Eastern Bengal, and probably near Comilla".
4. *IHQ*, Vol. X, pp. 321 ff. ; *Ind. Cult.*, Vol. I, p. 679 ; *Hist. of Bengal*, Vol. I, p. 222. The Pāla family acquired possession (*upārjita*) of Pūrva-khāṭikā.
5. *EI*, Vol. XXIII, pp. 225-229 ; Vol. XXVII, p. 119 ff.

outside Karṇāṭa.[1] He believes that the Rāṣṭrakūṭas like Mahana or Mathana ruling over Aṅga and those ruling at Pathari, 40 miles north-east of Bhilsa in Madhya Pradesh (760-865 A.D.), at Kanauj (1050-1210), Hastikuṇḍi in Jodhpur and Dhanop in Udaipur (900-1000), Bithu near Pāli in Jodhpur (1200-1815), Mānapura (6th-7th centuries), Berar (7th-8th centuries) and Orissa (11th-12th centuries) originally hailed from Karṇāṭa.

During such a period of large-scale movements and frequent wars, land becomes the dominant form of wealth and the chief instrument of economic power. Kings and feudatories were not unmindful of the fact that land and its products should not go beyond their control. In our present state of knowledge we can assert that the Gāhaḍavālas did not make any single land-grant in favour of feudatories holding a status higher than the *Ṭhakkuras* and *Rāutas* in the fertile Ganges-Yamunā Doāb.[2] In a large number of other cases, kings made their sons, brothers, nephews and close relatives their fiefholders. The Cāhamānas of Naḍḍūla followed this practice. Kaṭukarāja made his son Jayatasiṁha a fief-holder of Samipati.[3] Ālhaṇa (1145-63 A.D.) made his third son Kīrttipāla a feudal proprietor of 12 villages belonging to Naḍḍūlāī.[4] Kīrttipāla's sons, Lakhanapāla and Sonapāla, were made joint proprietors of Sonānā by their cousin-brother *Mahārājādhirāja* Kelhaṇa, the eldest son of Ālhaṇa.[5] Kelhaṇa (c. 1163-93 A.D.) also granted the fiefdom of Bāmnerā to Ajayasiṁha, son of Kuṁvarasiṁha who seems to be identical with *Mahārājaputra* Kumārasiṁha, the proprietor of the Koreṭā village during the reign of his father Ālhaṇa.[6]

1. *J. N. Banerjea Volume*, pp. 211-19.
2. Cf. grants in favour of *Rāuta* Rājyadharavarman, *Ṭhakkura* Jayapālaśarman, *Rāuta* Jāṭaśarman, *Ṭhakkura* Devapālaśarman, *Ṭhakkura* Vasiṣṭha, *Rāuta* Paharājaśarman, etc. (*DHNI*, Vol. I., pp. 517, 519, 528).
3. *E.I.*, XI. p. 32-33 (Sevadi inscr. 1144-45 A.D.).
4. *E.I.*, IX. pp. 68,60.
5. *E.I.*, XI. p. 73.
6. Sharma, *Early Chauhān Dynasties*, pp. 139, 142 ; *E.I.*, XIII, p. 208.

Kelhaṇa also gave the *jāgīr* of Ghaṁghāṇakapadra to his son Soḍhadeva.[1] The Kalacuri kings adopted the same practice as that of the Naḍḍūla Cāhamānas. Kokkalla I made each of his 17 younger sons *Maṇḍalapatis* or feudatory chiefs in his kingdom. The Kalacuris of Tuṁmāna trace their descent from one of those sons, named Kaliṅgarāja, and they remained feudatories of their relatives at Ḍāhala till at least KS 831/1079 A.D.[2] The Gaṅgas of Kaliṅga-nagara conferred the title of *Rāṇaka* on their relative the Kheḍis (Bhīmakheḍi, Dharmakheḍi, Ugrakheḍi, Udayakheḍi), who belonged to the Kadamba-kula. Those Kheḍis were *Pañcaviṣayādhipatis* or in charge of five districts and issued their grants from Jayantīpura in the modern Chikati Taluk in Ganjam.

Early mediaeval epigraphs also acquaint us with the fact that queens and wives of feudatories sometimes were made fief-holders by their husbands. Possibly those grants were motivated by love or the decision to make arrangements for their sustenance in the eventuality of the ladies outliving their husbands. But the digests of our period do not indicate that the wives were allowed to get shares on the partition of property during the lifetime of their husbands. However, a few Cāhamāna kings are found to make their queens *bhoktṛs*. Kelhaṇa's queen Jālhaṇadevī was the *bhoktṛ* of Saṇḍeraka which was the westernmost frontier province of the Naḍḍūla kingdom. Pratāpadevī, queen of Harirāja, enjoyed a fief at Tantoṭi in the Ajmer District in 1194 A.D.[3] About 250 years earlier, contiguous to that area, a queen named Citralekhā granted 2 villages in the old Jaipur State out of her fief to the temple of Nārāyaṇa.[4] The Bali

1. *J. P. A. S. B.*, X. p. 407 (Pal inscr. VS 1241/1185 A.D.).
2. Amoda inscr. (*Dynastic Hist. of N. India*, II, p. 805).
3. *E.I.*, XX. p. 62.
4. Bayana inscr. dated VS 1012/956 A.D. (*I.A.*, XIV, p. 10 ; XV, p. 36). H. C. Ray in *Dynastic Hist. of N. India*, I, p. 591 ; II, p. 823, identifies her husband Maṅgalarāja, a feudatory of the Gurjara-Pratihāra king Mahipāla II, with the Kacchapaghāta prince of an identical name mentioned in the Gwalior Sāsbahū temple ipscription dated V.S. 1150.

inscription, dated V.S. 1200/1143 A.D., informs us that *Rājñī* Tihuṇaka, queen of Jayatasīha or Jayasiṁha Caulukya, was enjoying the village Vālahī as a *grāsa*.[1] According to the Machhlishahr inscription, dated V.S. 1258/1197 A.D., the village Pamahai was granted by *Mahārājñī* Saṁnaṁdarī to king Hariścandra, who subsequently donated it to Rāhīhīyaka, son of *Ṭhakkura* Madanū.[2] The queen who was issueless, as the inscription records, must have been one of the queens of Jayaccandra Gāhaḍavāla. She is alone among the Gāhaḍavāla queens who had been given the privilege of enjoying proprietary rights over a village. All other queens, as known from inscriptions, gave charities with the consent and at the expense of their reigning husbands. In the kingdom of the Paramāra king Naravarman, Mahādevī, the *vadhū* (wife, may also mean daughter-in-law) of *Mahāmāṇḍalika* Rājadeva granted 4 *halas* of land out of her *bhukti*, to a Brāhmaṇa.[3] Dr. N. P. Chakravarti translates the words *Mahāmāṇḍalika-śrī-Rājadeva-vadhū-śrī-Mahādevyā pūrvva-kalpe dattā* in lines 15 and 16 as (4 *halas* of land) 'given by the illustrious Mahādevī from her previous settlement (?).' If we accept the interpretation of Dr. Chakravarti. there seems a probability that the aforesaid Mahādevī had landed properties elsewhere also. Thus the fiefdoms enjoyed by the queens and wives of feudatories were acquired by them not in a state of widowhood but during the lifetime of their partners. So the possibility of application for the recommendation of Jimūtavāhana that a widow has the right to inherit her husband's entire property in the absence of any male issue, does not arise at all in these specific cases.

As in Europe so also in India the merchants and nobility of wealth tried to become landed nobles. In ancient times merchants holding land are not known to have been vassals of persons for the land they held. We have already seen

1. *E.I.*, IX, pp. 32-33. *Grāsa* means *girās*, signifying landed possession of a ruling tribe (*Dynastic Hist. of N. India*, II, p. 1110).
2. *E.I.*, X, p. 99.
3. *Ibid.*, XX. p. 108.

how three merchants became masters of three villages in the Hazaribagh District through the favour of Ādisiṁha, king of Magadha.[1] In the neighbouring state of Orissa, during the reign of the Gaṅga king Madhukāmārṇava, Lakṣmaṇa Rāmadeva, holding the privilege of *pañcamahāśabda*, granted three villages to Eṛapanāyaka who was the ornament of the spotless family of merchants. What is more interesting in this Chicacole plate is that though those villages were termed as *vaiśya agrahāra*, yet the donee had to pay an annual rent to the extent of 150 rupees[2] or purchase the villages by paying 150 rupees, according to Dr. Sircar. The donee was at the time of the grant living as a resident of Dantapura which was a port as old as the time of Ptolemy.[3] Thus, a merchant, who must have been engaged in active service in that city-port of Dantapura, was not satisfied with movable property alone, but arranged for his security of wealth against lands. The same tendency of merchants to become proprietors of land on a feudal basis is also noticeable in Ajmer. Verse 10 of the Barla inscription of the time of Pṛthvīrāja III dated V.S. 1234/1178 A.D. records that *Ṭhakkura* Pālhuka was a trader by profession.[4]

The inclination of some active merchants towards vassaldoms is also noticeable among the goldsmiths of Orissa during the rule of the Gaṅgas of Kaliṅganagara and Svetaka. *Kāṁsyakāra Śreṣṭhī* Svayambhu and Khaṇḍimalla enjoyed the feudatory status of *Sāmanta*.[5] As a word of caution, it may be stated that the post of an engaver did not carry a fiefdom either in Orissa or any other part of Northern India. Under the Gaṅgas of Kaliṅganagara there

1. *Dynastic Hist. of N. India*, I, p. 349 (Dudhpani rock inscr.).
2. *Inscriptions of Orissa*, ed. S. N. Rajaguru, Vol. II, pp. 177 ff.
3. Majumdar, *Classical Accounts of India*, p. 380; Raychaudhuri, *PHAI*, pp. 89, 305 n.
4. *E. I.*, XXXIII, p. 299 ff. D. C. Sircar observes at p. 301, "it is uncertain whether he actually belonged to the mercantile class as well".
5. *Inscr. of Orisca*, Vol. II, pp. 120,124, 130, for Khaṇḍimalla and pp. 284, 300 for Svayambhu.

were such merchants who engraved copper plates and have described themselves simply as *Śreṣṭhī* Prabhākara, *Vaṇikputra* Hari.[1] Again, none of the engravers of the Pāla and Sena copper plates, except the engraver of the Deopara inscription, held a feudatory status. Śūlapāṇi, who engraved the Deopara inscription of Vijayasena, alone has the unique distinction of holding the title of a feudatory, *Rāṇaka*, in the history of numerous engravers who lived in Bengal and Bihar, since the ascendancy of Gopāla to the throne.[2]

Commerce was a risky venture throughout the middle ages. Roads were unsafe. Temper of rulers was unpredictable and the political stability was uncertain. Some merchants therefore were tempted to exchange their profession with that of a landed nobleman. Mere *Baniās* or *Seths* never commanded so much social prestige as the feudal lords. A few examples of the behaviour of early mediaeval kings with the commercial classes are given here. The grant of half of the town of Selluka and 1500 villages by the Paramāra king Bhoja to his subordinate Yaśovarman[3] shows that the ruling kings allowed their feudatories to control even the urban economy. Sometimes the kings levied additional taxes on merchants. During the reign of Rāyapāla, his sons, who were feudatories, issued an order that 2 *palikās* of oil due to them were to be collected from each oil-mill (*ghāṇaka*) in V.S. 1189/1132 A.D. Again in V.S. 1200/1143 A.D. another feudatory of the same king, asked also for 2 *palikās* of oil, due to him, from each oil mill. Thus within the course of eleven years during the reign of one king alone, each of the oil millers were asked to contribute at double the rate for the temple of Ādinātha at Nādlāi. Not only the dealers in oil were taxed, but merchants in general, were forced to pay taxes at enhanced rates at Nāḍlāi. In V.S. 1195/1137 A.D. they were asked

1. *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 40, 235.
2. *Ins. of Bengal*, Vol. III. p. 49 : चखान वारेन्द्रकशिल्पिगोष्ठीचूड़ामणौ राणक-शूलपाणिः ।
3. *E.I.*, XIX, pp. 69 ff. (Kalvan plate).

to pay some dues on every cartload of goods passing through the roads. Again, an additional impost was levied at the customs house in V.S. 1218/1161 A.D. In the neighbouring kingdom of Gujarat, Bhīma II levied fresh taxes on a large number agricultural products in 1220 A.D.[1] The misery of the business community did not end by payment of taxes. Their hearths and homes were also insecure. In Eastern India, the Bhāṭerā plate tells us that as many as 296 houses, including those of oil millers, ivory and bell-metal workers and shops were allotted by Govindakeśava, ruler of Sylhet, to a Śiva temple.[2] Anaṅgabhīma III (1216-35 A.D.) the Eastern Gaṅga king of Orissa, acted in a similar manner. He granted a township (possibly Jayanagara-grāma) which is 11 miles from Cuttack, and was then inhabited by goldsmith, brazier, 2 weavers, 2 oilmen, 3 fishermen, dealers in perfumery goods, conch-shells, etc., to Lord Puruṣottama in c. 1230 A.D.[3]

Donations of merchants of the period under survey convey an impression that they were poorer in comparison to the landed aristocrats. Not a single merchant has been found to donate a whole village or construct big temples, except under the Caulukyas and Vāghelas. At most, they have caused the excavation of channels and machine-wells and sometimes gave portions of their merchandise in charity. In order to construct or defray the expenses of temples, not one but several merchants pulled their resources together. As many as 9 chiefs of oil millers of four villages and all the members of the guild of oil millers came to an agreement that each one of them would give 1 *palikā* of oil on the 9th day of the bright half of every month for the illumination of the Vaillabhaṭṭasvāmin temple at Gwalior in V.S. 933/876 A.D. On the date of the agreement amongst the oil millers, the guild of gardeners also decided to give 50 flower garlands for the worship of the above-

1. *I.A.*, VI, p. 202.
2. *E.I.*, XIX, pp. 27 ff.
3. *E.I.*, XXVIII, pp. 244, 256 (Nagari plate).

mentioned deity at the same time.[1] Even in the Caulukya kingdom where the merchants were in more affluent condition, the *śreṣṭhī* and other *mahājanas* of Timbāṇaka, near Bhavnagar, agreed among themselves to donate one *rūpaka* per shop per year and each merchant of the same town undertook to give one *dramma* annually to the Śiva temples at Talājha in V.S. 1264/1207 A.D.[2] It is interesting to note here that the above-mentioned images of Viṣṇu and Śiva in Gwalior and Saurāṣṭra respectively, were not installed by the merchants, but by feudatories. The Vaillabhaṭṭasvāmin temple at Gwalior was built by Alla, the *Koṭṭapāla* or Guardian of the fort of Gwalior. The Śaiva temple was installed by the feudatory ruler Jagamalla. Thus it might not be unreasonable to suggest that the merchants of Bhavnagar and Gwalior were forced to give charities by the ruling overlords.

In early mediaeval India feudalism triumphed over the ideas of united realm and over-royal authority. The formation of territorial principalities had great impact on the politics, administration and economy of this country. Landed aristocrats held many of the superior posts and became members of the governing body. Of course, enfeoffment did not bring the concession of an office. The feudatories also directed the rural and urban economy. With the exception of Gujarat, they gained control over production and distribution. As some marchants became more interested in transforming themselves as feudatories, landed aristocrats gained a measure of control of the investment-capital. When feudalism was firmly established in North India by the end of the twelfth century, capital to a large extent, ceased to be invested in commercial enterprises outside the confines of the territories of the landlords. Much wealth therefore seems to have been utilized over building of temples and creation of religious endowments.

1. *E.I.*, I, pp. 154 ff. (Vaillabhaṭṭasvāmin temple inscr.).
2. *E.I.*, I, p. 272 (Cintra *Praśasti*).

CENTRAL LIBRARY

IV

Secular Land Grants of the Post-Gupta Period and Some Aspects of the Growth of Feudal Complex in Northern India

B. N. S. Yadava, Allahabad University

The growth of the feudal complex in the post-Gupta period may be traced along the practice of granting land to warriors, chiefs, officers and members of the clan. The practice of making outright religious gifts of land to Brāhmaṇas without any condition of service had been widely prevalent from an early period. By such grants the kings renounced their right to collect taxes and send their officials to the lands of the individuals in question. Some of the grantees must have exercised in varying degrees the profitable acts of government.[1] This must have contributed to the growth of the feudal complex. But the secular land grants[2] appear to have played a more important role in the process of feudalisation.

The *Arthaśāstra* and the Smṛtis, as Ghoshal[3] rightly thinks, contemplate the bestowal of assignment only on lower officials, especially those connected with local administration. But the testimony of Hiuen-tsang bears out that this system was later on extended to higher officers as well. The pilgrim states that the ministers of state and common officials, all

1. Cf. R. S. Sharma, *Aspects of Political Ideas and Institutions in Ancient India*, p. 204.
2. Sprott has rightly stated that feudalism implies not only 'an agricultural society in which there are large estates cultivated by persons in varying degrees of servitude' but also the holding of land on condition of service—either administrative or military and a personal relation of loyalty between the vassal and the lord. The latter aspect may be regarded as feudalism in the political sense (Sprott, *Sociology*, pp. 63-64).
3. U. N. Ghoshal, *Agrarian System in Ancient Indta*, p. 49. The practice of granting military fiefs might have been prevalent even in earlier times. S. K. Maity has noticed this even in the Arthaśāstra (*Economic Life of India in the Gupta Period*, p. 43). But it does not appear to have been wide-spread at that time.

have their portions of land, and are maintained by the cities assigned to them.[1] We gather from the *Harṣacarita*[2] also that Prabhākaravardhana divided his kingdom among his officers. In the *Kumārapālacarita*, we find a minister of the king enjoying 700 villages.[3] In the *Kathāsaritsāgara*, a royal priest in said to have received a grant of 100 villages.[4] An inscription[5] of Mahendrapāla II records the emperor's grant of a village which was in possession of a certain *Talavargika* Hariṣeṇa, meaning an officer of the same name. The *Udayasundarīkathā* (11th century A.D.) of Soḍḍhala refers to some land as the hereditary *dhruvavṛtti* of a *Kāyastha* officer.[6] We find in the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*[7] that king Avantivarman (9th century A.D.) divided his kingdom among his officers and also relatives. Instances of assignments in favour of the officers of state are also found in two Paramāra records[8] which mention the villages held by a *Mahāsādhanika* and a *Pratīhāra*.

There is ample evidence of purely military grants. A certain *Rājā* Buwad (7th or 8th century A.D.), one of the earliest ancestors of the Solaṅkī clan, is said to have distributed villages among his chiefs in 16 equal parts. He used to send eight of these chiefs (*paṭṭadharas*) to conquer in all the four directions.[9] In the *Kathākoṣa*[10] (10th century A.D.) of Harisẹṇa, we come across a military grant of a number of villages enjoyed by a *Sahasrabhaṭa* warrior who was admitted by the king to the order of the *Sāmantas*. In the closing years of the 11th century, as we gather from

1. Watters, *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India*, p. 177.
2. पृथुभिर्भृत्योपयोगाय व्यभजतेव वसुधां बहुधा—*Harṣacarita*, ed. A.A. Führer, p. 175.
3. *Kumārapālacarita*, N. S. P., Int., p. x.
4. *Kathāsaritsāgara*, Lambaka 3, Taraṅga 18, verses 124 ff.
5. *E. I.*, XIV, p. 13.
6. पूर्वपुरुषक्रमागताया ध्रुववृत्तेः प्रभुः—*Udayasundarikathā*, G. O. S., p. 152.
7. *Rāj.*, V. 21.
8. *I. A.*, XIV ; *E. I.*, IX, 13B.
9. *Ratnamālā*, A. K. Forbes, quoted in *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, Vol. IX, pp. 41, 45.
10. *Kathākoṣa*, Singhi Jain Granthamālā Series, p. 59.

the *Rāmacarita*, king Rāmapāla of Bengal 'granted land with unstinted generosity' to win the support of the chiefs and *Sāmantas*.[1] The *Sukṛtasaṅkīrtaṇa* of Amarasiṁha refers to the grant of the village of Bhīmapallī by king Kumārapāla of Gujarat to a warrior in recognition of excellent military service.[2] The *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* informs us that the Candella king Paramardi granted the *ādhipatya* of a region to the famous warrior Jagaddeva.[3] The *Laṭakamelaka* of Śaṅkhadhara (12th century A.D.) reveals that a *Rāutta-rāja* called Saṅgrāmavisara enjoyed certain villages (*grāmapaṭṭa*) for military service.[4] In Bengal the system of assignment of land for military service called *Kaivarta-vṛtti*[5] was common before the 12th century A.D.

The Kamauli plate[6] (1134 A.D.) refers to grant of a tract of land to a chief on *rājapaṭṭī* (royal filet or tiara) by one of the ancestors of Govindacandra Gāhaḍavāla. Vatsarāja, one of the descendants of this chief, has been mentioned as the feudatory of the emperor. The system of *rājapaṭṭī* was prevalent in later times also in some parts of Northern India.[7] There are many other instances of grants to chiefs which were for military service.[8] The wide prevalence of assignments of land for military service may also be inferred from the fact that Lakṣmīdhara in the *Brahmacāri-kāṇḍa*[9] of his *Kṛtyakalataru* explains the term *deśapati* as "warriors, etc."

1. Cf. H. C. Ray, *Dynastic History of Northern India*, Vol. I, p. 340.
2. मयासौ विक्रमाक्रीतमनसा धनसाइस: ।
   चकारि कारणं श्रीणां भीमपल्लीपुरप्रभु: ॥
   (*Sukṛtasaṅkīrtana*, Sarga III, verse 18).
3. *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*,, tr. Hajari Prasad Dvivedi (Singhi Jain Granthamālā), p. 141.
4. Saṅkhadhara was patronised by the Gāhaḍavāla kings.
5. *J. A. S.*, Letters, Vol. XVII, 1951, No. 2, p. 121.
6. *E.I.*, IV, No. 12.
7. C.W. Wills, *J.A.S.B.*, 1919-20, p. 197.
8. Cf. *Journal of Indian History*, Vol. 17, article of Radhakrishna Chaudhary, pp. 393 ff.
9. देशपति: सैनिकादि:—*ibid.*, p. 251.

Villages were granted to refugee chiefs also. The *Mānasollāsa*[1] of Someśvara states that making assignments of land in favour of refugee chiefs was one of the duties of the king. There is reference to a grant[2] of twelve villages to a refugee Guhila chief in Gujarat in the 12th century A.D.

In the inscriptions of the clan monarchies of the Gurjara Pratīhāras and others, we come across the instances of assignments not only to chiefs, troopers and state servants but also to the members of the clan and the relatives.[3] An inscription of the time of the Gurjara Pratīhāras reveals that a chief called Mathanadeva of the same clan had received an allotment of land as his own share (*svabhog-āvāpta*).[4] This system was continued by the other clan monarchies which arose after the decline of the Gurjara-Pratīhāra empire. Thus, in an inscription[5] of the Cāhamānas of Sambhar in Rajputana, dated 973-74 A.D., we find references to estates and fiefs held by princes of the blood royal, chiefs and an officer (*Duḥsādhya*). The term *bhoga* is most probably used here in the sense of a fief.[6]

Of the Cāhamāna house of Marwar of the 12th century, one document refers to a group of twelve villages which a junior prince had received from the reigning prince.[7] The others[8] refer to the queen's *grāsa*[9] and *bhukti*. Two other records[10] mention a couple of junior princes as *bhoktṛs*

1. *Ibid.*, Vol. II. pp. 100-107.
2. Cf. *Dynastic History of Northern India*, Vol. II, p. 1201.
3. B. N. S. Yadava, *Some Aspects of Society in Northern India in the 12th Century A.D.* (unpublished thesis), p. 147.
4. *E.I.*, III. 36.
5. *E.I.*, II. 8.
6. It should be noticed that the term *bhoga* appears in the Paramāra inscriptions also. Ganguli (*History of the Paramāras*, pp. 236 f.) apparently considers them to be the administrative divisions of the kingdom. But it is not impossible, under such circumstances, that in some cases the term implied a fief also.
7. *E.I.*, IX, 9B.
8. *E.I.*, XI, 4, No. XVII ; *E.I.*, XI, 4, No. V, pp. 32-33.
9. Cf. modern *girās* signifying the landed property of a ruling tribe (*Dynastic History of Northern India*, Vol. II, p. 1110, n. 5).
10. *E.I.*, XI. 4, Nos. XV and XVI.

(possessors) of two villages. Reference is made in another record[1] to the *sejā* (allotment) of a *Rājaputra* called Ajayadeva. Another inscription[2] refers to *rājakīya-bhoga* or the king's estate also.

The practice of granting land to members of the clan and relatives does not find a parallel in the Middle Ages of Western Europe where the great turmoil of conquest had weakened the kinship relations of clan and tribe.[3] Chinese feudalism, however, offers a parallel. 'The constitution of the clan in China demanded the distribution of the common property to the members of the clan and the ruler distributed the territories as fiefs to the relatives and adherents.'[4]

THE SYSTEM OF EIGHTY-FOUR

The system of 'eighty-four' was a peculiar practice of assignment in some regions of Northern India according to which a group of 84 villages was allotted to a chief. One of the earliest references to it is found in a Gurjara Pratīhāra record in which we are informed that a chief had acquired 84 villages by the might of his own arms.[5] In a Paramāra record of the 11th century A.D. also, we find that a chief had acquired a group of 84 villages on royal charter,[6] probably from his overlord. In the Ratnapur inscription from Rajasthan (12th century A.D.), there is reference to a chief called Pūnapākṣadeva who obtained from his overlord a fief of 84 villages.[7] If V. S. Agrawala's reading of the *Aparājitapṛcchā* be correct, the holders of 84 villages had formed a class of chiefs by the 12th century A.D., known as *Caturāśika*.[8]

1. *E.I.*, XIII, No. 188.
2. *E.I.*, IX, 9B.
3. *Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences*, Vol. 6, p. 204.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 213.
5. *E.I.*, IX, IA.
6. *E.I.*, XIX, No. 10 (चतुरासीतिमान्धकपद्द).
7. Peterson, *Collection of Sanskrit & Prakrit Inscriptions*, p. 206 (रत्नपुर-चतुराशिकायां महाराजभूपालश्रीरायपालदेवान्महासनप्राप्तश्रीपुनपाच्चदेव:).
8. V. S. Agrawala, *Harṣacarita*, p. 220.

In later times, we find this system widely prevalent in Rajputana[1] and the Rajput kingdoms of medieval Chattisgarh.[2] In the *Visaladeva Rāso*[3] also *Caurāsiyā*[4] or the holders of 84 villages are mentioned as a well-known class of chiefs.

It appears that some of these grants were by way of rewards, gifts or maintenace of certain individuals and were not specifically conditioned on any kind of future service. In such cases, though the giver had no legal claim on the recipients, yet there must have been the moral bond of gratitude and the condition of service must have been implied.

But we also find evidence of grants which were specifically conditioned by military service. A verse in the *Bṛhaspatismṛiti*[5] which has been quoted by Lakṣmīdhara (12th century A.D.) in his *Vyavāharakāṇḍa* refers to a written deed or charter known as *prasāda-likhita* by which the king bestowed landed and other property, when satisfied with the faithful services, valour, etc., of a person.

The *Lekhapaddhati*[6] contains a specimen document dated V.S. 802 for such a *prasāda-pattalā*.[7] The model *bhūrja-*

1. Baden Powell, *Land System*, Vol. 1. p. 250 ; *Indian Village Communities*, pp. 196 ff. ; Ghoshal, *Hindu Revenue System*, pp. 241-59.
2. C. W. Wills, The Rajput Kingdoms of Chattisgarh, *J.A.S.B.* (1919-20), p. 197.
3. Ed. Mata Prasad Gupta and Agara Candra Nahata. The editors assign this work to the latter part of the 14th century A.D. (Introduction, p. 5).
4. *Ibid.*, pp. 68 and 243.
5. देशादिकं (वंशादिकं) यस्य राजा लिखितं तु (लिखितेन) प्रयच्छति ।
   सेवाशौर्यादिना तुष्टः प्रसादलिखितं हि (तु) तत् ॥
   Bṛhapatismṛti, Geakwad Oriental Series, p. 63 ;
   Vyavahārakāṇḍa (G. O. S.), p. 159.
6. *Lekhapaddhati* (ed. C. D. Dalal, G.O.S. No. XIX), p. 7.
7. The India Office plate of Vigraharājadeva (12th century A.D.) recovered from Orissa or some part of India adjoining it, is also a kind of *prasādapaṭṭaka* (*E. I.*, III, No. 44).

pattalā document for granting a village to a *Rājaputra* by a *Rāṇaka* runs :—

···अमुकमण्डलकरणदेशादिमहाराणकश्रीअमुकः पत्तलां प्रयच्छति यथा। यत् श्रीअस्माभिः राज० अमुकाकस्य अमुकमण्डलकरणे उद्ग्राह्यमाणअमुकग्रामोऽयं देवदायब्रह्मदायवर्जं प्रसादपत्तलायां प्रदत्तः। ततोऽस्मिन् ग्रामे पूर्वरूट्या दानीवोलापिकागोचरतलाराभाव्यदानप्रभृति यत्किञ्चिदुद्ग्राह्यमाणं भवति तत्सर्वं राज० अमुकाकेन पूर्वरीत्या न्यायपूर्वमुद्ग्राहयितव्यम्। नवतरभूमौ शासने कस्यापि देवस्य विप्रस्य वा शासने न दातव्या। ग्रामे रक्षपालत्वं कार्यम्। क्षुद्रोपद्रवादिकं रक्षणीयम्।·····अपरमेव ग्रामस्यायपदं भोगवता (भुञ्जता) पदातिजन १०० घोटक २० एतैः घोटकमानुषैः कटके राजधान्यां श्रीअस्माकं सेवा कार्या।···

It reveals that such grants were of revenues. The chief was also responsible for the safety of the village. The grants were conditioned by military service with a fixed number of soldiers and horses. Sub-infeudation was prohibited. The grantee was under certain obligation to the master ; such grants were, accordingly, similar to the fiefs of Western Europe.

Some other specimen documents of V.S. 1288 refer to the seizure (*vyāṣedha*)[1] and confiscation (*grāsa-lopana*)[2] of the fiefs for failure to render military service or after the death[3] of the grantee. But such cases could have been possible only if the king was strong. This may be compared with the system of escheat prevalent in Western feudalism.

1. परमारराज० अमुकाकः श्रीमद्विजयकटके न प्रविष्टः। अतो राजादेशेन एतदीयग्रामो व्यावेधनीयः इति। (*Lekhapaddhati*, p. 24).
2. अमुकयुद्धे राजा नागपालो नायातः। तदस्यग्रामाः सङ्गात्यां कर्त्तव्याः। (*loc. cit.*).
3. अमुकराजासह युद्धे सङ्घायमाने राजा अमुकाको नष्टः। ततः स्वराजादेशेन एतदीयग्रामा राजसङ्गात्यां कर्त्तव्याः। (*loc. cit.*).

The *Udayasundarīkathā* of Soḍḍhala refers to *dhruva-vṛtti* or permanent tenure also in case of a royal officer.

The system of assigning fiefs for military service was one of the leading features of feudal polity everywhere.[1] Marc Bloch has rightly observed that the feudal system in the West had its roots in the problem of military protection ;[2] the fiefs developed as a means of ensuring military protection. In the absence of a salary system in a social setup in which the economic function was weak and the exchange became rare,[3] portions of land were assigned for remunerating services. Charles Martel in France, involved in the struggle against the Arabs and the domestic enemies, created numerous military fiefs.[4] The Norman kings of England also divided the whole country into military fiefs.[5] Under the Ottoman feudal system, the Sulṭāns too granted land in return for military service. The fief-holders were required to render military service on horse back when summoned by the Sulṭān. It is significant to notice that the distinction between giving revenues of land and giving land itself tended to disappear there.[6]

The exigencies of military service in an age of chronic warfare account for the wide prevalence of military grants during the post-Harṣa period in India, which brings out a significant aspect of feudalism. It also throws light on the growing tendency of feudalisation.

The fiefs often became hereditary especially with the waning of the royal power. Under such circumstances, governmental powers and privileges passed to the land-holder. Some inscriptions reveal that vassal chiefs holding only 84 villages had their own officers (see *infra*). The fusion of landholdership with the exercise of important

1. E.g. Maitland, *The Constitutional History of England*, p. 152.
2. *Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences*, Vol. 6, p. 210.
3. *Past and Present*, 1957 : 'Feudalism in Histroy' by Owen Lattimore, p. 54.
4. *Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences*, Vol. 6, p. 207.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 209.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 211.

governmental functions has been regarded[1] as a prominent political character of feudalism.

The descendants of Kumārpāla who had obtained only a tract of land on *rāja-paṭṭī*[2] aggrandised themselves and became feudatory kings under Govindacandra Gāhaḍavāla in the 12th century A.D. The descendants of a son of Paramāra Vākpati II (974-95 A.D.) who had acquired a fief of the Sukri valley within Jodhpur, became independent of the paternal branch, apparently after the death of Bhoja (1010-55 A.D.).[3] A Kalacuri inscription[4] of the 12th century A.D. reveals that one Śrī-Jāṭa was appointed as head of a *Viṣaya* apparently in reward for military service by Kalacuri Karṇa in the 11th century A.D. But by the 12th century his descendants became full-fledged feudatory rulers. Here we have an instance of hereditary officers creating chiefships obviously by self-aggrandisement by taking advantage of the weakness of the central government.

Again we find that the junior prince Kīrtipāla who had obtained only a group of 12 villages[5] from the reigning Cāhamāna prince Kelhaṇa of Naḍḍūla, became the founder[6] of the famous Jābālipura line of the Cāhamānas in the 12th century A.D. The descendants of the refugee Guhila prince also, who had acquired, as we have already noticed, 12 villages in Gujarat, created a principality for themselves.[7] The system of assignment to Kaivartas (*Kaivartta-vṛtti*) for military service was indirectly responsible for the raising into power of the Kaivarta chiefs and their formidable revolt in the closing years of the 11th century which overthrew the authority of the king in Bengal.

It is significant that, in the conditions of feudal decentralisation, the territory directly administered by the kings

1. H. Sidgwick, *The Development of European Polity*, p. 204.
2. *E.I.*, IV, No. 12.
3. *Dynastic History of Northern Iudia*, Vol. II, pp. 924-25.
4. *E.I.*, XIX, No. 53. p. 297.
5. *E.I.*, IX, 9B.
6. *Dynastic History of Northern India*, Vol. II, p. 1183.
7. *Ibid*, p. 1201.

and monarchs became considerably limited and they became more or less like their chiefs and feudatories, though holding larger territory than any one of them. Ghoshal notices this feature in the Cāhamāna monarchy when he says that 'the Assignments.....preponderated over the Reserved tract'[1] or the area directly administered by the king. But this state of affairs may be more or less true in case of almost all the monarchies of Northern India in the 11th and 12th centuries where this system was in vogue, and the use of the term *sva-bhoga*[2] by a Candella king and *sva-bhujyamāna*[3] by a Cālukya king perhaps throws light on the same.

Besides the role of the central agency, we also find other forces working for the feudal decentralization. Nothing to speak of the bigger feudatories, small vassal chiefs also tried to gather around them a group of followers. There is some evidence of sub-infeudation also. A chief of 84 villages who was the vassal of a superior chief Rāyapāla is said to have granted land to his *Mahāmātya.*[4] An inscription[5] (V. S. 933) in the rock-cut temple fort of Gwalior speaks of a religious gift of fields by a chief who was the vassal of Keṭṭapāla who, in turn, was the feudatory of the Lord Paramount Bhojadeva. The *Rājataraṅgiṇī* informs us that the weakness of the central government gave rise to a class of chiefs in Kashmir, known as the *Ḍāmaras.* It is stated that an adventurous *Kuṭumbin* procured some wealth, occupied the village and after gathering some retainers became a *Ḍāmara.*[6] They were like agriculturist barons and were an eyesore to the kings of Kashmir. They lived in magnificient palaces[7] and were engaged in constant warfare with the kings of

1. Ghoshal, *The Agrarian System in Ancient India*, pp. 57-58.
2. The Charkhari plate of Devavarmadeva (V.S. 1108), *E.I.*, Vol. 20. No. 14, p. 127.
3. Sunak grant of Karṇa I (1091 A.D.), *E.I.*, Part VI, No. XXXVI.
4. चक्रदोयमुवि भोक्ता महामात्य: ।
   (*Collection of Sanskrit & Prakrit Inscriptions*, ed. P. Peterson, p. 206).
5. R. L. Mitra, *Indo-Aryans*, p. 365.
6. *Rāj.* VII, 494-95.
7. *Samayamātṛkā* of Kṣemendra.

CENTRAL LIBRARY

Kashmir. More or less similar features recurred in other parts of Northern India also. The terms *gāmaroda* and *koṇḍio* were current in the *deśabhāṣā*[1] in the 12th century A.D. They refer to persons enjoying villages by a deceitful manipulation. This shows that sometimes clever persons managed to become village chiefs.

In some regions the village headmen also became like petty chiefs. The *Vastupālacarita* (c. 13th century A.D.) informs us that the *Grāmaṇīs* used to amass considerable wealth and break away from the central government in Gujarat.[2] The disappearance of the *Grāmika* or the village headman from the inscriptions of the 12th century A.D. in Bengal may indicate that the villlage headmen either got transformed into or were replaced by the class of chiefs known as the *Rāṇakas* and *Rājaputras* who are usually mentioned in those epigraphic records.[3] In the *Śukranīti*[4] the village headman appears to be a powerful, influential person who is charged with the duty of protecting the villagers not only from thieves and robbers but also from royal officers.

We also find evidence of the necessity of making private and local arrangements for protection which has been regarded as the most potent factor responsible for the growth of feudalism everywhere. In the commentary[5] of Medhātithi, we find a statement that the king cannot extend his arms and offer protection to every individual. It is further stated that some criminals become difficult even for the officers of the king. There is the visualisation of

1. *Deśīnāmamālā* of Hemacandra, II, 48, 90.
2. *Vastupālacarita*, p. 58.
3. Cf. B. Sen, *Historical Aspects of the Inscriptions of Bengal*, pp. 557, 559.
4. *Śukranīti*, Chapter II.
5. अथैवं व्याख्यायते—"धर्मो यत्रोपरुध्यते" "विप्लवे कालकारिते" राजनि व्यतिक्रान्तेऽसंस्थायां प्रवृत्तायां शस्त्रं ग्राह्यम्। अन्यथा तु सौराज्ये "राजैव रक्षतीति"—न हि प्रसार्य हस्तौ राजा प्रतिपुरुषमासितुं शक्नोति। भवन्ति केचिद्दुरात्मानो ये राजपुरुषानपि शूरतमाभियुक्तान्बाधन्ते शस्यवतस्तु बिभ्यतीति। सार्वकालिकं शस्त्रधारणं युक्तम्।
Medhātithi on Manu, VIII. 348.

a state of insecurity and the justification of making arrangements for local protection by taking to arms. This interpretation of the verse of the *Manusmṛti* has not been accepted by Medhātithi. But it appears to have a bearing on the actual state of affairs. When we read the history of Kashmir, for example, we find a state of continual disorder and chronic warfare in which a weak central government could not have performed effectively the duties of safeguarding life and property. Such conditions may be noticed elsewhere also in India. It may be noted that the conditions which gave rise to feudalism in Medieval Europe were characterised by the bankruptcy of the state and men lost the habit of expecting protection from a too distant sovereign.[1] This gave rise to the contract of dependence most characteristic of the feudal system[2] of Europe, by which the small man obligated himself to render services to the great man in return for protection and surrendered the ownership of his land, the former became a tenant on the condition of paying a rent in services and goods. In India, however, we do not find the evidence of such ties of dependence. Some cases[3] of commendation have been traced ; but they were essentially different from the type which we find in Europe. However, they reveal the attempt at local organisation of government.

Thus either by a royal grant placing villages under a feudatory chief, or by forceful occupation or by submission of the individuals, village after village must have acquired a lord. This must have led to the decline of the free village communities.[4]

All these tendencies contributed to the growth of a ruling

1. *Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences*, Vol. 6, p. 203.
2. Marc Bloch in the *Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences*, Vol. 6, p. 205.
3. Cf. R. S. Sharma, *Some Aspects of Political Ideas and Institutions in Ancient India*, p. 216 ; also R. K. Choudhary, *Journal of Indian History*, Vol. XXXVII, Pt. i, p. 391.
4. With the growth of the feudal tendencies, such practices became common in England also (Lipson, *The Economic History of England*, p. 15).

landed aristocracy[1] and large estates. The evidence of texts like the *Aparājitapṛcchā* and *Laṭakamelaka* and the inscriptions reveal that this class included the numerous *Rājaputras* and *Ṭhakkuras* who were petty chiefs holding a number of villages. They were at the bottom of the pyramidal structure which was formed with many grades of feudatory rulers with the king at the top.

FEUDAL RELATIONS AND FEUDAL MONARCHY

With the increasing process of feudalisation, the vassalage or the feudatory system which may be taken back to an earlier period[2] became more and more rampant. The kings and monarchs whose financial resources became limited, depended more upon their feudatories for military and other help, and the tributes realised from them. The political structure had become a network of vassal and suzerain relationship by the 12th century A.D.

The *Aparājitapṛcchā* (p. 201) classifies the feudatories in the descending order on the basis of the number of villages held by them—*Mahāmaṇḍaleśvaras*, *Māṇḍalikas*, *Mahāsāmantas*, *Sāmantas*, *Laghusāmantas* and *Caturaṁśikas*. The *Rājaputras* were petty chiefs who held only a few villages. The *Rājanīti-ratnākara* of Caṇḍeśvaramiśra divides them on the basis of their powers and tributary relations.[3] The royal feudatories also had their vassals[4] who in turn were the overlords of smaller chiefs.

The *Sāmanta* conventions like court attendance, military service and the payment of tributes became deep-rooted. The conversion of princes, chiefs and officers into *Sāmantas* became very common. The institution of the *pañca-*

1. For the growth of more or less similar tendencies in Medieval Europe, cf. *Cambridge Medieval History*, Vol. II, p. 652.
2. Cf. V.S. Agrawala, *Harṣacarita kā Eka Sāṁskṛtika Adhyayana*, p. 217.
3. B. N. S. Yadava, *op. cit.*, pp. 163-64.
4. See below. Also B. P. Majumder, *Socio-Economic History of Northern India*, p. 28.

mahāśabdas[1] was invented in some regions obviously to ensure the fidelity of the chiefs and officers in whom they were confirmed. The *Sāmanta* system led to administrative decentralisation also and there was no clear line of demarcation in the 11th and 12th centuries A.D. between high officers and *Sāmantas* in some regions of Northern India. The armies were composed of feudal levies. We get the evidence of chronic warfare. The military class developed a code of chivalry and loyalty[2] to the lord, which was, in theory at least, one of the highest virtues. But in actual practice the growing weakness of the central authority resulted in the feudatories becoming independent princes who practically refused to recognise their feudal relationship to the king.[3] This happened in feudal China and the German Empire of the Middle Ages also. The pride and power of the tributary rulers and chiefs had increased considerably by the 11th and 12th centuries and they had become jealous of their local independence. The two sets of Cālukya copper plates[4] (1074 A.D.) from Navasari suggest that a grant of some village, issued by king Karṇa (1064-94 A.D.) of Gujarat, was withheld by his *Maṇḍaleśvara* in whose jurisdiction the village in question lay, the reason being that the copper plate did not contain the name of the latter whose vanity was so much hurt that he got prepared another plate inserting his own name. In the copper-plate grant[5] from Sunderban (1196 A. D.) we find that a feudatory declares

1. Some sources indicate that there were five epithets. But other evidences reveal that they implied the privilege to use the five musical instruments *śṛṅga*, *śaṅkha*, *bherī*, *jayaghaṇṭā* and *ṭamaṭa*.
2. Personal loyalty to the overlord was considered to be a part and parcel of feudal dignity. In texts like the *Śiśupālavadha*, *Rājataraṅgiṇi* (VIII, 198, 2818-19) and *Dvyāśraya* (Vol. II, pp. 550-51), there are many instances of chiefs and soldiers fighting only with this sentiment for their masters.
3. B. N. S. Yadava, *op. cit.*, pp. 172 ff.
4. *J.B.R.A.S.*, Vol. 26, p. 258. The grant, however, does not appear to have been issued finally.
5. *I.H.Q.*, Vol. 10, pp. 322-31.

with pride that he is hostile to the *Mahārājādhirāja*. The Kudopali plates[1] of the time of Mahābhavagupta II (12th century A.D.) show that a local chief could enjoy in Orissa lofty titles and yet possess a very small territory. The Sanjan plates of Amoghavarṣa, belonging to the 9th century A.D., throw ample light on the relative power and position of kings and their *Sāmantas*.[2] 'The soul is the king, the mind is his minister, the group of senses is again that circle of *Sāmatas*, according to the political sciences : and speech, etc., are the servants conforming to the prescribed rules. Presiding over his place, namely the body, he (the soul) is able to enjoy independently his own *viṣaya* (kingdom, worldly objects) ; when that enjoyer is subject to *sannipāta* (a kind of fever, collision), they all perish.' This shows that the position of the king became in a sense dependent upon the *Sāmantas*. The actual power and influence of the monarch, under these circumstances, depended only on his personal prestige and military activities.

The kingdoms and empires by the 12th century A.D. had become a loose superstructure characterised by a network of loyalty in which a large number of chiefs and feudatory rulers of different gradations owed allegiance to the monarch. Thus, the number of feudatories in an empire or kingdom was considerably large. Kalacuri Karṇa in the 11th century boasted that he had 136 *Sāmantas*.[3] In the 12th century Pṛthvīrāja[4] Cāhamāna was supported in the 2nd battle of Tarain by 150 chiefs who were apparently his *Sāmantas*. The Cālukya empire under Kumārapāla had 72 big *Sāmantas*.[5] The title of the Gāhaḍavālas, *Samastarājacakra-saṁsevita-caraṇa*,[6] indicates that there were numerous feudatories in the Gāhaḍavāla empire as well. It is

1. *E.I.*, Vol. IV, No. 35.
2. *E.I.*, Vol. XVIII, No. 26 (verse 42).
3. *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, tr. Tawney, p. 73.
4. Briggs, *Tarikh-i-Firishta*, Vol. I, p. 175.
5. *Kumārapālacarita* of Hemacandra (N.S.P.), 1900, Introduction, p. xiii.
6. Cf. the Buzurg plates of Govindacandra (V.S. 1176), *E.I.*, Vol. XVIII, No. 123 (p. 221).

significant that the epithet of the Gupta monarchs was *Samastarājocchettā*[1] which goes to show by contrast how the feudal element in the political structure had increased since then. The Cālukya emperors also adopted the title *Samastarājāvalī-virājita.*[2] In the commentary on the *Rāmacarita*[3] of Sandhyākara-nandin, 14 feudatory rulers like *Rājā, Bhūpāla, Maṇḍalādhipati, Sāmanta-cakra-cūḍāmaṇi*, etc., are mentioned, besides and below whom there must have been many others.

The *Aparājitapṛcchā*[4] gives the picture of an ideal court which was attended by the following feudatories and chiefs of different status.

Maṇḍaleśa	...	4
Māṇḍalika	...	12
Mahāsāmanta	...	16
Sāmanta	...	32
Laghusāmanta	...	160
Chiefs holding 84 villages	...	400

There were a number of *Rājaputras* also. The bigger feudatories had their own vassals and the chain of loyalty sometimes went many layers deep. The Ratnapur stone inscription[5] of the time of Cālukya Kumārapāla (12th century) reveals that certain *Ṭhakkura* chiefs were the vassals of a chief of 84 villages called Pūnapākṣa who owed allegiance to *Mahārāja Bhūpāla* Rāyapāla who was most probably the ruler of Naḍḍūla-maṇḍala and was, in turn, a feudatory of Kumārapāla.

On the whole, real political authority was tending to become local everywhere. The *Aparājitapṛcchā* would have us to believe that from the *Cakravartin* down to the *Rājputas*, i.e. village chiefs, every one ruled his territory according

1. D. C. Sircar, *Select Inscriptions*, pp. 265, 279, 312, 318, etc.
2. *Collection of Prakrit & Sanskrit Inscriptions*, ed. Peterson, p. 206.
3. *D.H.N.I*, Vol. I, pp. 340-41.
4. *Ibid.*, G.O.S., p. 196, vs. 33-34.
5. *Collection of Prakrit & Sanskrit Inscriptions*, ed. Peterson, p. 206. Also the rock-cut temple fort inscription of Gwalior (supra, p. 81).

to his sweet will.[1] This is also corroborated by epigraphic evidence. In an 11th century inscription[2] of the time of Bhoja Paramāra, a chief of 84 villages, after paying due homage to his overlord, refers to his *Sāndhivigrahika* and other officers quite in the fashion of a monarch. In the Ratnapur inscription[3] (12th century) Pūnapākṣa, another chief of 84 villages, also addresses his *Mahāmātya* and *Sāndhivigrahika* after the usual mention of his political superiors.

Under such circumstances, the emperor or *Samrāṭ* became, as we find in the *Abhidhānacintāmaṇi*[4] of Hemacandra, the ruler of kings, that is the paramount lord of feudatories. In the *Nāmaliṅgānuśāsana* also, which Baver considers to be a work of the 11th and 12th centuries,[5] we find more or less the same definition of the term *samrāṭ*.[6] In a more material sense, as we notice in the *Rājanītiratnākara*,[7] which, though a work of the 1st quarter of the 14th century, may be said to look back to the political ideals at the close of Hindu India, the *Samrāṭ* became the tax-collector of the kings, a state of affairs which must have made the imperial yoke galling to the tributaries and resulted in *Sāmanta* uprisings and insubordination.[8]

The conception of empire lost the territorial aspect and the monarch no longer remained, as we find in ancient India, 'the aggregate of the people.'[9] The tributary relations which loosely bound together the nobles, chiefs, local rulers and the paramount lord came thus into prominent relief and the latter does not seem to have had

1. स्वके स्वभुक्तानुसारे राज्यं कुर्वन्ति ये च्छया। *Aparājitapṛcchā*, p. 194.
2. *E.I.*, XIX, No. 10.
3. *Collection of Prakrit & Sanskrit Inscriptions*, ed. by P. Peterson, p. 206.
4. स सम्राट् यश्चि यो नृपान्। (Martya Kāṇḍa, v. 680).
5. N. S. Press, Introduction, p. 1.
6. Kṣatriyavarga, v. 740.
7. सकलराजाभ्यो यः करयाड़ी स सम्राट् (ed. K. P. Jayaswal, p. 3).
8. In a verse of the *Naiṣadha*, we find the tributaries often withholding the payment of taxes and tributes and the sword of the emperor rising in grim impulse for their chastisement (XI. 126).
9. *Arthaśāstra*, Shamasastry (1923), p. 378.

any actual duties to the people. The establishment of an empire only meant the extension of the tributary system on a large scale.[1]

Such empires or tributary superstructures naturally lacked solidarity, stability and real political unity. But what is more significant is that, being cut off from the people, they must have lost to a great extent the moral support of the latter.

THE MIDDLE CLASS OF MERCHANTS AND TRADERS

In India, society was not divided so sharply into the two extremes of nobles and peasants as we find in some regions of Medieval Europe especially in the north and east of what is now France.

With the rise of feudalism in Europe, the middle class and the activities of trade and commerce came almost to a standstill. In India, however, a separate class was set apart from very early times for the pursuit of trade and commerce. With the periods of political confusion, the frequent wars, the rise of robber chiefs,[2] and the decline of money economy,[3] trade and commerce received a difinite setback in many regions of Northern India. This must have led to decline of the middle class of traders and merchants to a considerable extent ; but it did not vanish as in Medieval Europe. It appears that the higher strata of the merchant class began to join the feudal order. The lower strata got lowered down in the social and economic

1. E.g. यस्माभिः करदं व्यधायि हिमवद्विन्ध्यान्तराल भुवः। (inscription of Vigraharāja Cāhamāna dated V.S. 1220, *I.A.*, Vol. XIX, p. 218).

2. E.g. ततास्ति घूघुली घोरकर्मा धर्मातिगस्थितः।
मण्डलीको महातेजः भूपतिगर्वपर्वतः॥
* * * * *
यो वणिग्जनसार्थानां लुंटाकी विकटाकृतिः। (*Vastupālacarita*, p. 100).
Also Elliot and Dowson, Aligarh ed., Int. ; D. Sharma, *Early Cāhamāna Dynasties*.

3. B. N. S Yadava, *Some Aspects of Society in Northern India in the 12th Century A.D.*, p. 274.

strata and, as Alberuni[1] noticed in the 11th century A.D., there was no marked distinction between the Vaiśyas and the Śūdras.

A merchant called Jayyaka amassed wealth and became a *Ḍāmara* chief in Kashmir.[2] In Bengal, the Suvarṇa-baṇiks became the rival of the Sena kings and tried to measure swords with the kings of Gauḍa.[4] In Gujarat, there was a number of merchant princes who were the feudatories[3] of king Jayasiṁha Siddharāja. The *Moharājaparājaya*[5] gives the description of the fabulous wealth of a merchant prince.

THE PEASANTRY AND AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS

In the Apabhraṁśa writings[6] of the 11th century, contained in the *Prākṛtapaiṅgala*, we get the description of an average welltodo peasant who possessed a fertile land (*dhanajutta-dharā*), a thatched house with high walls, and loyal servants. This reveals the existence of a class of free peasants who owned their fields and cultivated through servants and also hired labourers. The term *kuṭumba-kṣetra*, occurring in the land grants, has been taken to mean the fields which the cultivators owned absolutely.[7] But the evidence of Medhātithi[8] suggests that *kuṭumbi* was a share-cropper also. The terms *kṣetrapati*, *kṣetrasvāmī* and *kṣetrika* occurring in relation to the *Karṣakas* in the Dharmaśāstra

1. Alberuni's India, tr. Sachau, Vol. I, p. 101.
2. *Rāj.*, VII, 494-95.
3. T. C. Das Gupta, *Aspects of Bengali Society*, pp. 258 ff.
4. *Nalavilāsa-nāṭaka* of Ramachandra Sūri, Gaekwad's Oriental Series, Introduction, pp. 27-28 ; Altekar, *I.A.*, Vol. 54, p. 53.
5. *Moharājaparājaya*, Int., p. 10.
6. *Hindikāvyadhārā*, ed. Rahul Sāṅkṛtyāyana, pp. 315-17.
7. V. V. Mirashi, *C.I.I.*, Vol. IV, Pt. i, p. clxxi.
8. धर्मसीरी धर्मिक: कुटुम्बी भूमिकर्षक इति य उच्यते ।
(Medhātithi on Manu, IV. 253).
In the early Pali texts, however, the *Kuṭumbikas* figure as house-holders of substance (R. S. Sharma, *Śūdras in Ancient India*, p. 233).

works[1] reveal that there were, on the one hand, the owner of the fields, the proprietors or landlords, and, on the other, the cultivators who were the humbler occupants of the fields. The *Mahāpurāṇa* of Jinasenācārya[2] (10th century A.D.) suggests that the Śūdras constituted the bulk of the latter class. This class appeared to have included the temporary peasant[3] to whom the land was leased out by the owners and also, as the evidence of Medhātithi suggests, the share-croppers, the produce-sharing peasants. There were different classes of the produce-sharing peasants.[4] Besides, there were petty hired labourers like the plough-driver,[5] some of whom must have been landless labourers. The widespread practice of granting one village or a piece of land to a Brāhmaṇa or any other person must have led to the emergence of a class of landlords over the cultivators in normal times. Baden Powell[6] and Radhakamal Mukerji[7] have referred to a phenomenon which may be regarded as applicable not only to the later history of India but also to

1. *Vivādaratnākara*, p. 227 ; *Mitākṣarā* on Yāj. II, 158. The *Vivādaratnākara* refers to the *kṣetrasvāmi* and the sub-tenants or temporary occupants. The king was above the Kṣetrasvāmi—भूमिं कर्षणार्थं गृहीत्वा यः स्वयं न कर्षति परद्वारा वा न कर्षयेत् स स्वामिने सदं दाप्यः दण्डं राज्ञश्च तत्समम् (p. 229).
Also *Mitākṣarā* on Yāj., II, 150.
2. यामाः वृत्तिपरिक्षेपसावाः स्युरुचिताश्रयाः ।
क्षुद्रकर्षकभूयिष्ठाः सारामाः सजलाशयाः ॥ (*Mahāpurāṇa*, XVII. 164).
3. Cf. R. S. Sharma, *Aspects of Political Ideas and Institutions in Ancient India*, p. 223.
4. The Smṛtis of Manu (IV. 253), Viṣṇu (LVII. 16) and Yāj. (I. 166) show that the Śūdra share-croppers were entitled to half the crop. But the *Bṛhaspatismṛti*, and the *Vyavahārakāṇḍa* (p. 401) of Lakṣmidhara in which it has been quoted lay down that the *Siravāhaka* should get $\frac{1}{3}$ or $\frac{1}{5}$ of the produce.
5. The term *kināśa* has been explained in the *Vivādaratnākara* (p. 158) as plough-driver (कीनाशकस्य हलवाहकस्य). At another place, the term *kināśa* has been explained as *kṛṣibala* (*ibid.*, p. 124). It has further been pointed out that $\frac{1}{10}$ of the produce has been fixed by Nārada for the wages of the agricultural labourers other than the *Śiravāhakas* (नारदीयश्च दशमांशकल्पनं शौरवाहकेतरभृतकविषयम्—*Vivādaratnākara*, p. 158).
6. *Land Systems of British India*, Vol. I, pp. 134, 152.
7. *Land Problems of India*, p. 29.

this period. When the connection of a chief or individual is with a limited land, it generally tends to turn into personal and proprietary connection, especially when it becomes hereditary. The Brāhmaṇa donees who belonged to a religious class and also the common individuals, who received land grants, could in some cases have become like chiefs. We do find in the *Kathāsaritsāgara*[1] that a royal priest who enjoyed 100 villages became like a *Sāmanta* (*sāmanta-tulya*). But what is more likely is that a grantee or his descendant who enjoyed a village only and held the land more directly than the chief in his greater estate, became in a sense the landlord over the cultivators. Temples and monasteries also became land-owners during this period, for lands and villages were assigned to them also. In the area of a landlord, the original title of the cultivators or soil-occupants must have been interfered with to some extent. It may, therefore, be surmised that in some cases peasants might have been reduced to the status of share-cropper and temporary tenants. Then again the *Uktivyaktiprakaraṇa*[2] of Dāmodara (12th century A.D.) reveals that persons of superior energy often divided and occupied the villages. The growth of the class of landlords must have contributed to the decline of the economic status of the peasants living in the villages.

In the territories of chiefs holding large estates, who appear to have claimed the superior right of overlordship or rulership, we find the evidence of over-taxation. The Maināmatī songs[3] (c. 12th century A.D.) inform us that over-taxation was a terrible plight of the peasants. Exorbitant taxes were imposed in the territory of a feudal chief with the result that the peasants had to sell their ploughs, plough-shares, yokes and all other requisites of cultivation. Ultimately, they went to the extent of selling their children.

1. Lambaka 3, Taraṅga 18, vs. 124-26.
2. बलाद्धिर गाउ बाट—बटि विभाजनि (*Uktivyaktiprakaraṇa*, 40/21).
3. The songs of Rājā Māṇikacandra in *J.A.S.B.*, Vol. 47, pp. 135 ff.; also T. C. Das Gupta, *Aspects of Bengali Society*, pp. 86-87.

The *Vikramāṅkadevacarita*[1] of Bilhaṇa informs us that a feudatory chief amassed treasure by oppressing the subjects and resorting to questionable ways of financial extortion in order to increase his army which would enable him to rise into successful rebellion against his overlord. The *Udayasundarikathā*, *Laṭakamelaka* and *Vaspupālacarita* also throw light on the financial extortions by feudatory chiefs.[2]

We find long lists of taxes which were realised by kings and monarchs also in the 11th and 12th centuries A.D. Besides, the Gāhaḍavāla and Candella kings sometimes sanctioned to the donees other specified and non-specified dues (*niyatāniyata-ādāya*[3]) and the *ucita* and *anucita* demands.[4] The literary and epigraphic sources reveal that the practice of extracting forced labour (*viṣṭi*)[5] increased during the post-Gupta period.

Under these circumstances, the economic condition of the peasantry declined to a considerable extent. The poverty of the peasantry had become a favourite theme among Sanskrit[6] and Apabhraṁśa[7] poets of this age. The tales of Lāmā Tāranātha[8] also suggest the same. The armies often plundered the fields of the villagers[9] and they were also oppressed[10] by the royal officers.

In the feudal society of medieval Europe, the most characteristic phenomenon was the great estate or the manor.[11] In the manorial economy, the practice of employing agricultural labourers played a negligible role. The

1. Ed. Bühler, Sarga 14.
2. *Some Aspects of Society in Northern India*, pp. 303-04.
3. *E.I.*, p. 99.
4. *Journal of the U. P. Hist. Society*, Vol. XXIII, Pts. 1-2, pp. 228-50.
5. E.g., *C.I.I.*, Vol. IV (ed. Mirashi), p. clxxii.
6. E.g. *Avadānakalpalatā* of Kṣemendra, XXIV, 94-96; *Sūktimuktāvali*, Oriental Institute, Baroda, p. 441.
7. *Hindikāvyadhārā*, p. 315.
8. *The Mystic Tales of Lāmā Tāranātha*, Int., p. v.
9. *Rāj.*, VIII. 168-70.
10. *Narmamālā* of Kṣemendra.
11. Cf. Paul Vinogradoff in *Cambridge Medieval History*, Vol. II, p. 649.

lord cultivated his estate not by hiring agricultural labourers but by allotting tenaments on the condition[1] of predial service on his farm. These tenants in villeinage, holding servile tenure, formed an indispensable element in the structure of the manor. In the agricultural arrangements existing in India, as the Dharmaśāstra works reveal, the main part was played by field labourers[2] and servants who sold their labour on the basis of wage contracts. Under such circumstances, the servile tenure, the fundamental basis of the manorial economy, which became wide-spread due to the absence of the class of wage-earners in Medieval Europe, could not have developed here.[3] The peasants in India like the free peasants of Europe had to pay a number of dues and were required to do forced labour, not because of the unfree status and servile tenure which was the case with the serfs, but in recognition of the authority of the chiefs and kings. The Śūdra peasants and field labourers occupied the lowest status under the *Cāturvarṇya* scheme. While defining the legal status of the Śūdra, Medhātithi states[4] that he possessed absolute right to personal freedom and property and that he could not be given away or pledged like a slave. Thus the Śūdra peasants cannot be equated with the unfree serf of Medieval Europe.[5]

1. E. Lipson, *The Economic History of England*, pp. 83, 30.
2. There are sections on the employment of labourers and servants and the wage contracts. Different kinds of agricultural labourers like the *Sīravāhakas* (crop-sharers), *Kṛṣibalas* and others are mentioned. Their wages in kind are also laid down (e.g. *Vyavahārakāṇḍa* of Laksmidhara, sections 61-62).
3. The growth of the class of rural wage-earners led to the break of the manor in Europe (cf. E. Lipson, *Introduction to the Economic History of England*, Chapter III.)
4. यदि शूद्रो विद्यमानधनः स्वातन्त्र्येण जीवेद् ब्राह्मणाद्यनपाश्रितो न जातु दुष्येत्। न हि तस्य दानाधानक्रिया युज्यते—क्रीतग्रहजादिदासवत्।
(Medhātithi on Manu, ed. by G. N. Jha, p. 231).
5. Some grants (e.g. the Candella grants, *E.I.*, Vol. XX, p. 131, l 19; *E.I.*, Vol XXXII, pp. 121-23) speak of the donated village along with the right over the inhabitants thereof, peasants, merchants, traders, artisans, etc. It is not any kind of ownership, but only the authority over the persons, as the source of privileges, which the kings appear to have transferred to the donees in such cases.

V

Origin of Feudalism in Ancient India[1]

Haran Chandra Neogi

Sanskrit College, Calcutta

The researches of Dr. Sharma have illuminated to some extent an unexplored sphere of Indian history, viz. 'orign and growth of feudalism in Ancient India.' He was hadicapped by dearth of material and therefore, he could not throw much light on all aspects of the problem. This, of course, does not mean that there was no feudal stage in Indian society.

It is unnecessary to argue how far the characteristics of European feudalism agree with those of India, because under different environment different human societies responded differently and gave rise to dissimilar phenomena in course of the evolution of society. Call it feudalism or not, there is no denial that India developed an economic system chiefly based on land. This is one of the fundamental characteristics of feudalism. From the social point of view, it expresses a human relation with reference to their connection with land. Politically, it means partial transfer of king's authority on land to someone else on certain conditions. Other peculiarities are variable. That India had such an economy is confirmed by the land system of later ages, which must be a legacy of ancient India.

It is difficult to accept that feudalism developed in India some time about 300 A.D., as propounded by Dr. Sharma. There is ample reason to believe that it had a more distant origin in India and, owing to the slow progress of Indian society, it took a long time to be conspicuous.

Then, the most important problem to be investigated is where and when this new system began to develop in India. A vague, yet correct, answer to the question is that feudalism originated where the basis of slave economy was weakened. The growth of feudalistic economy depended

1. The revised copy of this paper was received in May, 1965.—Ed.

on the degree by which slavery was decaying. For a long time, therefore, the two systems remained overlapped. As positive evidence in the present stage of our knowledge is lacking in this respect, we may approach the problem from a different end.

Every social change requires the support of an ideology —a spiritual equipment armed with which man is inspired to action. This ideology includes a society's superstitious religious beliefs and artistic ideals.[1] Religious idea or philosophy of a people influences to a certain degree man's outlook on society. On the other hand, economic and social changes also react powerfully on the religious idea or philosophy of a society.[2]

In Europe, Christianity broke down the basis of slavery in the Roman empire and elsewhere.[3] In the later age Catholicism became the philosophy of feudalism. Protestantism weakened feudalism by attacking Catholicism and paved the way for Capitalism.[4] Rousseau was behind the upheavals of 1789 in France and Karl Marx supplied the philosophy of Socialism in Russia. On the strength of this analogy, we may try to find out the Indian Jesus Christ who preached the gospel against slavery explicitly or implicitly.

Most probably in India Buddhism supplied the philosophy that weakened slavery and strengthened feudalistic factors. It is well known that Buddha preached the doctrine of piety, social equality and economic justice, worthlessness of caste divisions that imposed restrictions on occupations and Brahmanical rituals being a source of exploitation to the poor. Most of his converts came from the common and economically oppressed classes. Two other classes, i.e., the

1. Gordon Childe, *What Happened in History*, pp. 14-17.
2. R. H. Tawney, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*, Preface.
3. E. Lipson, *Europe in the 19th and 20th Centuries*, p. 35 ; Carl L. Becker, *A Survey of European Civilization*, p. 99; *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Vol. XX; Edward Gibbon, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, Vol. I, pp. 430 ff.
4. Tawney, *loc. cit.*

Traders and kings, interested in the formation of a larger political unit by destroying the tribal organisations, became followers of the Buddha.

The new ideology gave a serious shaking to the old order of things and brought a new lease of life in the society by freeing men from caste bondage. The ideology brought mobility of labour which was indispensable in the age for the growth of industry.[1] Men of different castes now could easily assemble in a workshop without the fear of sin incurred by intermixing. The same opportunity was opened up for the merchants who could freely form Traders' Guilds which helped to raise large capital for distant trade and big industries. Moreover, Buddhism ensured peace and fair and truthful dealing so much necessary for their transactions. This justifies rapid growth of towns of different sizes and various industries in the age immediately after the death of the Buddha.[2] Brahmanical restrictions on going to alien land and taking up other occupations,[3] necessary to check the fugitive tendency of slaves, was removed. The condition apparently became such that the slaves and the downtrodden section of the society could no longer be kept under control unless some sort of privilege was granted to them. This factor along with the growth of population which is an outcome of the discovery of new means of subsistence forced the State to take up a wide programme of rehabilitation in waste lands[4] and to liberalise laws concerning slaves.[5]

The political role of Buddhism in the formation of feudalistic states in India is no less important. A united Buddhist church offered an example for a united people. One church head served the example for one king instead of a number of hostile tribal chiefs. The ideals of tribal war, private

1. *Cambridge History of India*, Vol. I, p. 187.
2. *The Age of Imperial Unity*, p. 599 ; cf. A. Birnie, *An Ecomomic History of the British Isle*, p. 34.
3. Manu, VIII. 102 ; XI. 70 ; IV. 214-16.
4. *Arthaśāstra*, Bk. II, Chap. I.
5. *Ibid.*, Bk. III, Chap. XIII.

vengience and cruelty were replaced by the ideals of peace, tolerance and justice.[1]

Three royal patrons of the Buddha, viz. Prasenajit, Bimbisāra and Ajātaśatru ruled over feudalistic states. Prasenajit is described as the head of a group of five *Rājās*.[2] Bimbisāra had *maṇḍalikarājas* under him.[3]

Two other pieces of interesting information regarding the support of the Buddha to the feudalistic monarchs and the Buddhists' interference in politics to serve their interest come from Pali literature. During the war between Ajātaśatru and the Vajji confederacy, Vassakāra visited the Buddha, apparently for counsel, who told him that the confederacy could not be overcome in battle, but only by cunning, by breaking up their alliance.[4] Thus the Buddha was the brain behind the empire building of Ajātaśatru who later became a follower of the Buddha. Another information is that Ajātaśatru could be defeated and imprisoned by Prasenajit, when two Buddhist officers of Ajātaśatru divulged State secrets in the course of conversation in a Saṅgha, which were overheard by Prasenajit's men present there.[5] Probably at this time Ajātaśatru was anti-Buddhist and it was a deliberate plot. Thus Buddhism seems to have supplied the ideology and took active part for a change in the society favourable to feudalistic developments.

For more than two centuries, Buddhism remained confined to Eastern India alone. The prophet king Aśoka, with noble aim of redressing the sufferings of the oppressed, made Buddhism a universal and international religion. He, thus, not only unconsciously encouraged the philosophy that ruined his empire, but conciously decentralised the empire allowing a free hand to the *Rajjukas* in all public

1. Cf. G. T. Warner, *The New Ground-Work of British History*, pp. 26–27 ; J. R. Green, *A Short History of the English People*, p. 30 ; E. M Tanner, *The Renaissance and the Reformation*, p. 22 ; A. Birnie, *op. cit.*, p. 27.
2. H. C. Raychaudhuri, *Political History of Ancient India*, p. 155.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 208.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 214, note.
5. D. R. Bhandarkar *Lectures on the Ancient History of India*, p. 77.

works and administrative business.[1] Due to his policy of non-aggression, supply of new slaves was stopped and this led to a crisis. Aśoka himself tried to solve this crisis by issuing decrees for better treatment towards the slaves[2] or, in other words, he probably tried to rehabilitate the slaves in industry and on land. The policy of Aśoka seems to have given the last shattering blow to the dying slave-economy, which also hastened the downfall of the Maurya empire based on slavery and founded the nucleus of feudalism.

The *Arthaśāstra*, supposed to be a product of the Maurya age, mentions *Ayudhīya* land, i.e. land held by officers on condition of supplying troops to the king.[3] The system is comparable to the Muslim *Jāgīr* system. A kind of assignment expressed by the phrase *rājabhoggaṁ raññā dinnaṁ rājadāyaṁ brahmadeyaṁ* found in Pali literature has been explained as alienation of the king's right.[4]

The process of feudalisation seems to have been further accelerated in the next age under the Śuṅgas. In this age, the reformed Brahmanism included social equality in its doctrine and moreover indulged in chivalry and valour discarded by Buddhism. This new ideological equipment became more suitable for the growth of feudalistic states. From the *Mālavikāgnimitra*, we know that Agnimitra, son of *Senāpati* Puṣyamitra, ruled from Vidiśā under the overlordship of his father residing in a distant capital. Further, Agnimitra established Yajñasena and Mādhavasena in two different kingdoms as his subordinates with the approval of his *Mantri-pariṣad*.[5] Similar example of division of authority under the Śuṅga suzerainty comes from Ayodhyā, Kauśāmbī, Mathurā and Pañcāla where rulers with names ending in *mitra* reigned.[6] It is likely that their status in the Śuṅga empire was the same as that of Agnimitra at Vidiśā.

1. P.E. IV.
2. R.E. IX, XIII.
3. U. N. Ghosal, *Contribution to Hindu Revenue System*, p. 46.
4. U. N. Ghosal, *The Agrarian System in Ancient India*, p. 27 ff.
5. *Mālavikāgnimitra*, Act V.
6. *Comprehensive History of India*, pp. 104 ff.

The Sātavāhanas who were contemporaneous with the Śuṅgas also ruled with the help of powerful feudatories.

The socio-economic condition of the Śuṅga age, which may be called a turning point in Indian history, is also reflected on the Śuṅga art which is basically different from that of the Mauryas. This difference is so vital that Rowland compares it with the Greek art of the transitional period of the Periclean age.[1]

Further impetus to feudalism came from the Bactrian Greeks who had assimilated the Persian and Seleucid feudalistic systems and brought them into India. This becomes evident from their title, *Basileos Basileon* implying thereby a king over many sub-kings and also from the Satrapal form of their government.[2]

VI

Mediaeval European Feudalism and Manorialism

versus

Ancient Indian Landed Economy[3]

S. K. Maity, Jadavpur University

A great deal of controversy has been raised by Indologists on the existence of feudalism or manorialism in the landed economy of ancient India. We have to review the nature and content of the feudalism and manorialism of the different countries of Europe and Asia in order to get at a clear picture. They are thoroughly discussed by Marc Bloch,[4] M. M. Postan,[5] J. L. A. Calmette,[6] P.

1. Rowland, *Art and Architecture of India*, p. 45. Cf. N. R. Ray, *Maurya and Śuṅga Art*.
2. J. N. Banerjea in *Comprehensive History of India*, p. 219.
3. The article was received in June, 1965.—Ed.
4. *Feudal Society*, tr. L. A Manyon, London, 1961.
5. *Ibid.*, Foreword hy M M. Postan.
6. *La Soeiété Féodali*, Paris, 1923.

Vinogradoff,[1] R. W. Carlyle,[2], C. H. Becker,[3] W. S. Davis,[4] G. B. Adams,[5] K. Asakawa[6] and many others. They have thrown some revealing light on the various aspects of feudalism and manorialism.

Was feudalism "a phenomenon, *sui generis*—an event which happened once in the world ?"[7] This question was raised by Montesquieu.[8] It may be "a very old form which, with differences in its working, subsists in three quarters of our hemisphere".[9] This was suggested by Voltaire.[10]

The term *feudalism* comes from the word *feudum*[11] which refers to the military organisation. The history of feudalism in Western Europe is mainly the story of baronial and knightly contracts of service.[12] If we examine the later development of feudalism in most of the European and other countries, the identification of feudalism with knightly or military service will not cover many of the socio-economic issues associated with it.[13] Particularly the Anglo-Soviet historians differ in their view points. The English historians attach importance to military fiefs.[14] But the Russians emphasise class domination and exploitation of peasants by landlords.[15] But they are criticised by the English school of thought. In their opinion the Russian argument is "packed tight with the Marxist furniture : the state as a vehicle of class rule, 'commodity exchange' as a solvent of feudalism, feudal economy as an antecedent of early capitalism."[16]

1. *Cambridge Mediaeval Hist.*, Vols. I-VI.
2. *History of Mediaeval Political Theory in the West*, Vols. I-V, 1903-28.
3. *Der Islam*, V. pp. 81-92.
4. *Life on a Mediaeval Barony*, New York, 1923.
5. *Civilization during the Middle Ages*, New York, 1914.
6. *Early Institutional Life of Japan*, Tokyo, 1903.
7. *Feudal Society*, p. 441.
8. *Loc. cit.*
9. *Loc. cit.*
10. *Esprit dés Lois*, XXX. I.
11. *Encylopaedia Britannica*, s.v. *Feudalism.*
12. *Feudal Society*, p. xiii.
13. *Ency. Brit., loc. cit.*

14-16. *Loc. cit.*, note 15.

But Marc Bloch's review of feudalism will include most of the important characteristics of European feudalism.[1] In his opinion, "a subject peasantry, widespread use of the service tenement (i.e. fief) instead of salary which was out of the question ; the supremacy of a class of specialised warriors ; ties of obedience and protection which bind man to man and, within the warrior class, assume the distinctive form called vassalage ; fragmentation of authority—leading inevitably to disorder ; and, in the midst of all this, the survival of other forms of association, family and state, such seem to be the fundamental features of European feudalism."[2] In course of further discussion, he holds that the feudal economy also includes a dependent pesantry, slackened social and commercial intercourse, sluggish circulation of money, regional mentality, the fief, knighthood (a landed warrior class), vassalage and fragmentation.[3] The last four characteristics were the most potent factors in the socio-economic structure of many European countries from the ninth to thirteenth centuries. But in Russia the deplorable state of the "dependent pesantry" was solved as a result of the Revolution of 1917.[4]

But the origin and development of feudalism in Muslim countries were entirely different from that of Western Europe.[5] It was purely based on money economy. In those countries it grew out of the administration and the dispersal of lands conquered by the Arabs. Their emperors appointed governors to rule the conquered provinces. The governors mainly looked after the civil administration of their provinces. But the lands were farmed out to the fiscal administrators

1. *Feudal Soc.*, p. 446.
2. *Loc. cit.*
3. *Feudal Soc.*, pp. 59-71, 163-75, 220, 443-44, 446 ; *Ency. of Social Science*, Vols, V-VI. s.v.
4. B. Pares, *Hist. of Russia*, London, 1958, pp. 507-562 ; G. V. Rauch, *Hist. of Soviet Russia*, London, 1957, pp. 34-77.
5. *Ency. of Social Science*, V-VI ; *Ency. Brit.*, 9.

on a fixed rent basis.[1] Both of them were responsible separately or jointly to the emperor in respective capacities. In spite of that there were certain initial defects in the whole system. As soon as the central government became weak, the provincial governors at once succeeded in becoming financial administrators as well.[2] After this fusion new states and dynasties originated. Egypt under the Tulunids is a good example of this process.[3]

The same process of disintegration took place within the provinces, for the tax farming system was also common in the districts and villages.[4] Gradually the great land owners became the tax farmers of the districts and the villages. But unlike the fief holders of the West they had no military obligations to the higher authorities.[5]

In China feudalism was in existence as early as the third millennium B.C.[6] King Wu Wang was the founder of the Chou dynasty about 1100 B.C. He granted fiefs to his followers.[7] Afterwards the first ruler of the Shang dynasty distributed large territories to his relatives, generals and ministers.[8] But the full ownership of land was not granted to them ; still they could enjoy the unrestricted use of the land. The grantees had certain obligations to the king. Thus, in the opinion of O. Franke, the grants were very similar to the fiefs of Western Europe.[9]

It is also suggested by some Indologists that the system of land tenure in ancient India can be well compared to that of the manorial system, in Europe.[10] The European manorial system of land tenure was interwoven with the economic, social and administrative organisation in the Middle Ages.[11] According to this system, the land tilling peasants were first attached to the landowning class.

The nucleus of this system was the manor. A good

1. *Ibid.*
2. *Ibid.*, note 24.
3. *Ibid.*
4-9. *Ibid.*, note 24.
10. L. Gopal, *Jour. Soc. Ec. Hist. of the Orient*, Lieden.
11. *Ency. Social Science*, Vols. IX-X ; *Ency. Brit.*, s.v. *Feudal Soc.*, pp. 249-254.

number of peasants' holdings were attached to it. In other words, within a manor, a landlord reserved a small portion of land for his own use. But the rest of the land was distributed among his dependent peasants.[1] In return the peasants had to oblige the landlords with their services and dues. They also looked after the upkeep of the manor. The various economic activities of the manor comprised work in the fields, in the pastures, in the meadows, in fishing and bee-keeping and in the minor industries. By dint of their labour all the requirements of the landlord as well as of the community were thoroughly satisfied.[2] The surplus produce was apparently sold out in the market for internal and external trade. The manorial system in Europe was, thus, economically a self-sufficient unit in an age of economic decentralisation and barter economy.[3]

To a greater extent the manorial system had helped the economic growth of the country and helped the administration of the country with the larger amount of taxes. After making a careful survey of this system, Rudolf Kötzschke remarks, "the institution of manor becomes in a very real sense the reflection of feudalism in its periods of expansion during the early Middle Ages and later during its period of gradual decline".[4] Here, it is perhaps implied that both feudalism and manorialism as an economic system had certain fundamental similarity.

Gradually the manorial system was practised over wide areas of Europe. It greatly helped the progress of agriculture and stock-breeding as well as the growth of the community life.[5] However, the germ of this system was traceable to the Roman *latifunda*. According to the Roman system consolidated areas were cultivated by many slaves. Those slaves were grouped round a central "villa". They had to render services to the lord's estate. They might

1. *Ibid.*
2. *Ibid.*
3. *Ibid.*
4. *Ency. Social Science*, Vols. IX-X, s. v.
5. *Feudal Soc.*, pp. 249-54.

be granted a separate house and a small plot of land. They became, thus, a *servus casatus*. Along with them the small free tenants (*colonus*) were allowed to rent a plot of land, sometimes with a house.[1] The big land-holders were also entrusted with the administration of taxes and justice. Their power and social position were steadily on the increase. By the end of the Roman period they exercised control over both consolidated and scattered domains. Thus, the above two types of the manorial system existed in the early Middle Ages in Italy, Gaul, Spain, South Britain and along the Rhine.[2]

Although some of their characteristics can be traced to the ancient Indian politico-economic system, yet the term feudalism or manorialism in the European sense cannot be properly employed to explain the entire phenomenon. The "military service" and "the contractual principles" were prominent among the Rajputs after the Muslim invasions.[3] In this connection A. L. Basham has rightly remarked, "Ancient India had, however, a system of overlordship, which was quasi-feudal, though never as fully developed as in Europe, and resting on a different basis".[4] The political and socio-economic situations in ancient India were very different in their nature and character from that of mediaeval Europe. Of course, not any portmanteau formula, nor feudalism, nor manorialism can adequately explain the political and socio-economic situation in ancient India. But one can casually correlate the major groups of phenomena in ancient India, if one accepts landlordism or quasi-feudal structure with certain modifications.

Thus, obligations of different forms formed the very essence of European feudalism and manorialism. They may be classified as political (i.e. military and others), economic and social. So far as the ancient Indian system is

1. *Ibid.*
2. *Ibid.*
3. A. L. Basham, *Wonder that was India*, London, 1953, p. 94.
4. *Ibid.*

concerned her political set up was different from that of medieval Europe.

THE SAMRĀṬ AND THE RĀJAN

In the Vedic literature,[1] the term *Samrāṭ* is used. He was, thus, simply an 'emperor' who had many feudatory kings ruling under him. Again, he is further described as king of all—both gods and men[2] and as the supreme lord of the whole universe.[3] The heavenly king Indra is described as an eminent warrior and a great leader of tribes. He had the thunder-bolt at his disposal. He pulled down the strongholds of Dasyus.[4] Gradually, Indra consolidated his position and ultimately became *Samrāṭ* (Universal monarch).[5]

Besides *Samrāṭ*, the term *Rājan* is very frequently referred to in the Vedic literature. It generally connotes a king employed in the sense of a noble or a chief.[6] In the same literature the word *Rājanya* is also employed in the sense of the royal and noble families. The royal court was generally graced by many nobles : and, thus, they claimed themselves the same social position with the emperor.[7] This relationship was further cemented by marriage alliance among themselves. Thus, the king among the kings was finally fit to be the *Samrāṭ*.[8] In religious practices a marked difference can also be noticed. The *Rājasūya* sacrifice was performed by the *Rājans* and the Vājapeya by the *Samrāṭ*.[9] During the course of the sacrifice the *Samrāṭ* was accepted as overlord by all the vassal chiefs and lords.[10]

1. *R. V.*, I. 25. 10 ; II. 28. 6 ; V. 85. 1 ; VI. 68. 9 ; VIII. 42. 1.
2. *R.V.*, II. 27. 10.
3. *R.V.*, II. 28. 1 and 82. 2.
4. *R.V.*, I. 32 ; *A.V.*, VIII. 8. 1-7.
5. *Ibid.*
6. *R.V.*, I. 40. 8 and I. 108. 7.
7. *R.V.*, X. 42. 10 and 97. 6 ; *A.V.*, V. 18. 10.
8. *Vedic Index*, II. 433.
9. *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, V. 1. 1.3. 12. 13-14.
10. *Śatapatha Br.*, V. 2. 2. 14-15.

After the coming of the Aryans a few centuries had passed. Many big and small states had sprung up all over India and they had sporadic warfare among themselves. Thus, for their mutual benefit many big and small states used to establish their quasi-feudal relations. It is here relevant to point out that Yudhiṣṭhira was prepared to conclude peace with the Kauravas, if he was allowed to enjoy only five villages in order to form his small kingdom. Thus, in the epic period, there were good many petty states and small kingdoms all over India. They were apparently ruled by petty chieftains, called *Rājans*. It is recorded in the Sabhā-parvan of the *Mahābhārata* that there were *Rājans* at every house. It was naturally difficult for them to obtain the distinction of a *Samrāṭ*.[1] The same section also refers to the overlordship of Jarāsandha over many *Rājans*. Out of political necessity they selected him, for he was the most powerful king. Even many of them intended to be his officers.[2]

Sometimes a *Samrāṭ* conferred the title of *Rājan* to his vassal chiefs and apparently granted some villages as their dominions. In the *Mahābhārata*, for instance, Arjuna did not like to meet Karṇa in an armament contest, only because the latter did not belong to a royal family and had no kingdom. But his oponent Duryodhana at once granted the kingdom of Aṅga to Karṇa. He was also accepted as a close friend of Duryodhana. Karṇa was installed a king with the performance of the prescribed religious ceremonies by the Brāhmaṇas.[3]

From the earliest times another new politico-religious factor helped the growth of the quasi-feudal state in India. Yudhiṣṭhira, Rāmacandra and many others sent out their horses of the Aśvamedha sacrifice accompanied by a band of picked soldiers. They were supposed to roam about freely in all the quarters. Immediately after that, an Aśvamedha

1. XV. 2.
2. *Ibid.*
3. *Mbh.*, Ādi-parvan, CXXXVIII.

sacrifice was performed. "All the kings of the earth with folded hands waited on him with presents of various kinds of gems, wealth, precious stones, pearls, corals, much gold, silver, first-class kine, handsome horses, etc."[1] They then assumed the titles *Digvijayin*, *Samrāṭ*, *Ekarāṭ*, etc. On another occasion like the *Svayaṁvara* of a king's daughter, many big and small kings assembled.[2]

But the relationship between an emperor with his subordinate rulers was not always very healthy. They were sometimes jealous of the power and magnificence of their overlord.[3] Just to avoid such political complexities the emperor was always advised to foster good relation with the defeated kings.[4] Dhṛtarāṣṭra advises, "A powerful king should never seek to exterminate weak kings, for these do good to the world by cherishing the good and punishing the wicked."[5]

The war of succession, civil strife and lawlessness were in vogue throughout our ancient and mediaeval periods. Just to overcome these situations, emperors (*Samrāṭ*) always preferred to be associated with a good number of subordinate chiefs and nobles. In our epic literature there are references to their loyalty. They even preferred to sacrifice their lives in the battlefield for the sake of their overlord. They followed the maxim of "sweet it is to die in battle, the path of heaven lies in fighting".[6] Thus, in the great battle of Kurukṣetra many vassal kings sided with the Kauravas and the Pāṇḍavas and had lost their lives in the battle-field.

The *Rāmāyaṇa* also presents the similar type of political setup as the *Mahābhārata*. Daśaratha is often depicted as an emperor (*Samrāṭ*),[7] although his empire roughly

1. Ādi-p., CXII.
2. Ādi-p., CLXXXVII ; Vaṇa-p., LV-LVII, LXX-LXXI.
3. Śānti-p., LXX, 30-31.
4. Sabhā-p., V.
5. Āśramavāsika-p., VI. 16.
6. Karṇa-p., CIV ; Āśramavāsika-p., III. 28.
7. Bālakāṇḍa, VII.

comprised the ancient kingdom of Kośala. His capital was at Ayodhyā.[1] But he claimed to have exercised his suzerainty over a considerable part of Northern India. Quite a large number of vassal states used to pay him regular tribute.[2] His horse-sacrifice was well-attended by many vassal chiefs and they also presented him with many costly articles.[3] Furthermore, the emperor always reserved the right of awarding rewards and punishments to the vassal chiefs. Kiṣkindhā was a vassal state of the Ikṣvāku kingdom. When Rāma was in exile, it was under the jurisdiction of his younger brother, Bharata. But Rāma was not happy with the activities of Vālin. He killed Vālin and then placed his younger brother Sugrīva on the throne.[4] After that, Sugrīva gave a very commendable service to Rāma in his war against Rāvaṇa.

Numerous Jātaka stories also give us a picture of a similar political set-up. There were many sovereigns along with their vassals all over India.[5] We are also told that an emperor had conquered thousand kings.[6] Besides political, the vassal kings from time to time had to fulfil many social obligations to their overlord. Sometimes they had to give their daughters in marriage with the *Yuvarāja* and their sons had to serve the royal master in different capacities.[7] Besides the emperors and lesser kings, there were many landlords in ancient India.[8]

Even many of the great dynasties of Northern India failed to safeguard their north-western frontiers. When the central power became feeble, the frontier chiefs or governors revolted and achieved their independence.[9] Even the

1. *Ibid.*, VI
2. Bālakāṇḍa, V.
3. *Ibid.*, XIII.
4. Kiṣkindhā-kāṇḍa, XVIII.
5. III. 155; IV. 200.
6. III. 159
7. V. 282.
8. III. 155; IV. 220; IV. 237, 370.
9. VI. 31.

foreigners, such as the Indo-Greeks, Śakas, Parthians, and in the later period the Hūṇas and many others invaded India through the north-western gate. The emperor was very often required to put down the rebellions and apparently his deputies had no power to stop it.[1]

In the sixth century B.C. the Buddhist *Aṅguttaranikāya*[2] traces the foundation of the "sixteen great kingdoms" (*soḷasa-mahājanapada*). Apparently, there were many small kingdoms and vassal states all over India. Undoubtedly, they had to discharge certain military obligations and other functions on behalf of the great kingdoms. But we are not in a position to know the nature of their duties from early sources. In course of time, Magadha held the commanding position in Northern India at the cost of other states. The great Maurya emperors Candragupta and Aśoka were the great "king of kings" in ancient India. In Rock Edict XIII,[3] Aśoka demanded adherence to the Law of Piety from the neighbouring small kingdoms like the Coḷas, Pāṇḍyas, Satyaputra, Keralaputra and Tāmraparṇī in the south, and Syria and other kingdoms in the north-west. From Aśoka's edicts, it is also evident that he gave them occassional advice and established philanthropic institutions in their dominions. In other words, he regarded them as object of spiritual conquest (*dharma-vijaya*). Thus, the rulers of those small kingdoms were supposed to fulfil the moral obligations to Devānāmpriya-priyadarśī Aśoka. Moreover, the Mauryas were able to establish a strongly centralised monarchy over the major part of ancient India.

But, after the death of Aśoka, the Maurya empire was definitely on the wane. The Śuṅgas (c. 185-112 B.C.) and the Kāṇvas (c. 112-78 B.C.) ruled only a portion of Northern India. North-Western India became the battle ground of the Bactrians, the Parthians, the Śakas and subsequently the

1. I. 304, 437 ; II. 315 ; III., 400, 497 ; IV. 189.
2. P.T.S., I. 213 ; IV. 252, 256, 260 ; also *Mahāvastu*, I. 34 ; *Jaina Bhagavatisūtra*, XV. 1.
3. *Select Ins.*, p 35.

Kuṣāṇas. During the same period, a fairly large empire was established by the Sātavāhanas in the Kṛṣṇā-Godāvarī valley. Many petty independent or semi-independent states also sprang up all over India.

About 320 A.D., the second Magadhan empire was established by the Imperial Guptas. But, under them, the centralised administration was conspicuously absent. Apparently, a good number of vassal states used to pay tribute and supply troops to the imperial army. In this connection, R. C. Majumdar remarks, "The Gupta emperors did not directly administer the whole country which was formally included within the empire. There were feudal chiefs, referred to as *Mahāsāmanta* who assumed the title of *Mahārāja*."[1]

Gupta and Ghaṭotkacha were simply *Mahārāja*.[2] They were semi-independent rulers holding sway over a small kingdom. But their successor Candragupta I was a powerful sovereign. His empire roughly comprised the regions of Magadha and Kośala.[3] His son and successor Samudragupta was a great conqueror and a brilliant administrator. He made devastating campaigns over the major part of India.[4] Perhaps, he failed to bring all the parts under one administrative control. He had apparently followed a middle course between the strict imperial control and full local autonomy. There were many tributary states, monarchical and republican, which enjoyed autonomy after paying tribute. Moreover, the independent states like those of the Śakas and Kuṣāṇas were submissive to the great emperor. All the forest states offered subordinate alliance. The twelve major powers of the Deccan were defeated by him. They were then re-instated after paying homage and money. Thus, the so-called feudal tendency ramained unabated even after his numerous conquests.[5]

1. *Hist. of Bengal*, Vol. I, p. 264.
2. Fleet, *C.I.I.*, Vol. III, p. 6.
3. H. C. Raychaudhuri, *Pol. Hist. Anc. India*, pp. 445-46.
4. Fleet, *op. cit.*, p. 6.
5. *Select Ins.*, p. 254 and p. 258.

His son Cadraguta II and his successors Kumāragupta I and Skandagupta were great warriors. They had an army composed of infantry, cavalry, chariots, elephants and ships. During the time of war, the imperial forces apparently requisitioned the service of the feudal militia. It was evident from the title of the feudal chiefs like *Mahārāja*, *Mahāsāmanta*, etc.[1]

In the Śaka war, Candragupta II was assisted by many petty kings and feudal chiefs with their military force. Vīrasena-Śāba "came here (Eastern Malwa), accompanied by the king (Candragupta) in person, who was seeking to conquer the whole world."[2] He was the inhabitant of Pāṭaliputra and the *Śaciva* (minister) of Chandragupta II. It is further recorded in the Sanchi and Udayagiri cave inscriptions of Candragupta II that "many of his ministers, generals and feudatories assisted him in his Śaka campaigns."[3]

Towards the close of the reign of Kumāragupta I, the subordinate chiefs like the Puṣyamitras of Central India revolted against the Gupta authority.[4] His son Skandagupta (c. 455-68 A.D.) was the last great emperor of the Gupta dynasty. After his death the process of disintegration continued rapidly. It is suggested by some Indologists that the growth of unchecked quasi-feudal tendency accelerated the speed of disintegration. As H. C. Raychaudhuri points out, "The same causes were at work which proved so disastrous to the Turki Sultanate of Delhi in the fourteenth century, and the so-called Mughul Empire in the eighteenth, viz. outbreak of rebellions within, devastating invasions from without, the growth of a class of hereditary governors and other officials who commanded enormous influence in local centres and assumed the titles of *Mahārāja* and *Mahārājādhirāja*, and dissensions in the imperial family itself."[5] Thus, the Maitrakas of Valabhī gradually declared

1. Fleet, *op. cit.*, p. 286, 289, etc.
2. Fleet, *op. cit.*, p. 25, No. 10.
3. *Pol. Hist. Ant. Ind.*, p. 467.
4. *Select Ins.*, p. 321 ; Fleet, *op. cit.*, p. 53.
5. *Pol. Hist. Ant. India*, p. 532.

their independence.[1] Yaśodharman of Malwa defied his Gupta lords about 533 A.D. and erected pillars of victory after his conquests.[2] By the middle of the sixth century A.D., the Maukharis established themselves in the Bara-Banki, Jaunpur and Gaya Districts of Uttar Pradesh and Bihar.[3] About the same time the rulers of Bengal also asserted their independence.[4]

Some other features of the quasi-feudal characteristics also can be gathered from the epigraphs of the Gupta time. The feudatory chiefs like the Ucchakalpīyas and the Parivrājakas in their land grants first acknowledged the sovereignty of their Gupta overlords. They had also feudatory chiefs. For instance, *Mahārāja* Hastin in his epigraphs at first recorded his due obligations to the Gupta emperor and then proceeds to address his own feudatories.[5] They assumed the titles of *Mahārāja*, *Rājan*, *Sāmanta* and *Mahāsāmanta*. Among them the favourites were sometimes addressed by the Sovereign as *Sāmantacūḍāmaṇi*.[6] The titles *Mahārāja* and *Mahāsāmanta* were used by Samudrasena, his ancestors and others in their inscriptions.[7] For their good services sometimes a noble was raised to the position of *Mahārāja*. *Mahārāja* Droṇasiṁha was installed to the position of a feudatory king by his royal master.[8] Moreover, in another record *Mahārāja* Hastin was placed in charge of eighteen forest chieftains.[9] The boundary pillars were very often set up between the kingdom of different feudatories.[10] Like their sovereign they also performed the *Aśvamedha* sacrifice.[11]

1. *Pol. Hist. Ant. India*, p. 533.
2. *Select Ins.*, p. 393 ; Fleet. *op. cit.*, p. 146.
3. *Pol. Hist. Anc. India*, p. 535.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 536.
5. Fleet, *op. cit.*, Nos. 21 and 22 ; *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XVII, 1888, p. 183.
6. Fleet, *op. cit.*, Nos. 48, 49, 50.
7. *Ibid.*, Nos. 3, 10, 12, 80.
8. *Ibid.*, No. 38.
9. *Ibid.*, No. 25 ; also see Nos. 16, 19.
10. *Ibid.*, No. 22.
11. *Ibid.*, No. 56

LAND-GRANTS AND THE QUASI-FEUDAL TENDENCY

From the earliest times numerous lands were donated either to the Brāhmaṇas or to the Buddhists or Jain Saṁghas. Most of the donations were made either by the king, the queen or their officials, or by private individuals or guilds for religious merit. There is one record of the donation of land by a Brāhmaṇa to another Brāhmaṇa. Vāsudeva-svāmin, a Brāhmaṇa of Vāraka-maṇḍala, donated a piece of land to the virtuous Brāhmaṇa Somasvāmin, for his own religious merit and for that of his parents.[1] Probably Vāsudevasvāmin had no knowledge of Vedic learning. Now, we have to determine how far the donated lands and villages had certain similarity with the fiefs or the manorial system of mediaeval Europe.

The *Arthaśāstra*[2] refers to land grants to (i) Brāhmaṇa with the right of alienation, (ii) crown officers for expenses of public charities, (iii) queens and princes, (iv) officials, in usufruct, for payment of services, (v) as military fiefs on condition of supplying troops. But the last implication of the *Arthaśāstra* is nowhere mentioned in epigraphs.

In the first century B.C., Nāyanikā, the wife of Śātakarṇi I, donated a village as a gift (*dakṣiṇā*) in an Aśvamedha sacrifice.[3] Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi of the same family permanently granted 200 *nivartanas* of land to the Buddhist monks residing on the Triraśmi hill.[4] Dr. D. C. Sircar suggests that one *nivartana* of land comprises 2.975 acres, so that 200 *nivartanas* comprise little less than 600 acres of land.[5] Thus, the Buddhist monks would enjoy such a large area of land without interference by the state. Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi and his family would accept only religious merit out of this donation and no feudal obligation, as stated above, was attached to it by him. A few other examples

1. *Ind. Ant.*, 1910, p. 200-201.
2. *Arth.*, ii. 1.
3. *Select Ins.*, p. 188.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 191.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 192, note 1.

of land grants of the later period will further explain their politico-economic implication in the light of the above context.

From records like the spurious Gaya and Nalanda plates of Samudragupta, the Bhitari stone pillar inscription of Skandagupta, the Khoh plates of Hastin,the Khoh plates of Sarvanātha, the Arang plates of Mahā-Jayarāja, the Raipur plates of Mahā-Sudevarāja, the Siwani plates of Pravarasena II, the Majhgawam plates of Hastin, the Karitalai plates of Jayanātha, the Khoh plates of Jayanātha and the Khoh plates of Sarvanātha, we know that whole villages were donated for religious and charitable purposes.[1] At the request of *Mahārāja* Rudradatta, *Mahārājādhirāja* Vainyagupta endowed eleven *pāṭakas* of land at Gunaighar to the *saṁgha* belonging to the Mahāyāna sect.[2]

The fiscal and other exemptions and immunities are specially recorded in the grants. In most of the Gupta and post-Gupta inscriptions the same general conditions are repeated again and again. So we cite only one example here—the Chamak plates of *Mahārāja* Paravarasena II,[3] which donate land to one thousand Brāhmaṇas. This grant reads, ".....Be it known to you that, in order to increase our religion and life and strength and victory and dominion, (and) for the sake of (our) victorious office of justice, as a grant not previously made, with libations of water...It is not to pay taxes, it is not to be entered by the regular troops or by the umbrella-bearers ; it does not carry with it (the right to) cows and bulls in succession of production, or to the abundance of flowers and milk, or to the pasturage, hides, and charcoal, or to the mines for the purchase of salt in a moist state ; it is entirely free from (all obligations of) forced labour ; it carries with it hidden treasures and deposits, and the *kḷpta* and *upakḷpta*, it is (to be enjoyed) for the same time with the moon and the sun ; (and) it is

1. Fleet, *op. cit.*, pp. 52, 93, 106, 117, 121, 125, 135, 191, 196, 243, 245 ; *E.I.*, Vol. XXV, p. 50.
2. *Select Ins.*, p. 331.
3. Fleet, *op. cit.*, p. 241-42.

to follow (the succession of) sons and sons' sons. No hindrance should be caused by any one to those who enjoy it. It should be protected and increased by all possible means. And whosoever, disregarding this charter, shall give, or cause to be given, even slight vexation, we will inflict on him punishment, together with a fine, when he is denounced by a Brāhmaṇa. And this condition of the charter should be maintained by the Brāhmaṇas and by (future) lords ; namely (the enjoyment of this grant is to belong to the Brāhmaṇas) for the same time with the moon and the sun, provided that they commit no treason against the kingdom, consisting of seven constituent parts, of (successive) kings ; that they are not slayers of Brāhmaṇas and are not thieves, adulterers, poisoners of kings, etc. ; that they do not wage war ; (and) that they do no wrong to other villagers. But, if they act otherwise, or assent (to such acts), the king will commit no theft in taking the land away.....". Thus, for the first time, from the Gupta inscriptions we hear a note of warning that the donees should act justly towards both the villagers and the state. Moreover, the taxes and other dues from which the donee was to be exempted, those reserved by the king and those transferred to him, were all recorded in detail. Again, the villagers were asked to pay the customary tributes and royalties to the donee, and to render him all obedience. The Khoh plates of Sarvanātha state, ".....you yourself shall render to these persons the offerings of the tribute of the customary royalties, taxes, gold, etc., and shall be obedient to their commands.....And to those kings who shall be born in our lineage,—by them the grant should not be confiscated (but) should be assented to."[1] Thus, the donor not only abandoned his revenues but also the right to govern the inhabitants of the villages that were granted. It tempts some Indologists to trace the origin of feudalism in ancient India.[2]

1. Fleet *op. cit.*, p. 132.
2. R. S. Sharma, *Political Ideas and Institutions*, pp. 202-33.

But the political and other obligations, which were the very essence of the European feudalism and manorialism, were altogether absent in the ancient Indian land-grants. An abstract form of religious obligation was only attached with them. It is recorded in the Baigram and the Paharpur copper plates that the king would only receive one-sixth of the religious merit out of the donation.[1] But it has no relationship with feudalism and manorialism as we understand today from the European standard texts.

However, from a careful survey of the Gupta and post-Gupta inscriptions, we arrive at the conclusion that a vast area of land was given away either to individual priests or to religious institutions. The surviving donative inscriptions and copper plates can only be a tiny fraction of the total once existing. Thus, the gradual accumulation of lands into the hands of the Brāhmaṇas and others helped the growth of a class of landed aristocracts who were no other than the Zamindars of the later period.

VII

Aspects of Politico-Economic History of Ancient India[2]

B. D. Chatterjee, Burdwan University

The issues which I seek to meet, quite inadequately though, within the brief compass of this paper, were raised by a number of scholars on the first day of the first Seminar organised by the Centre of Advanced Study in Ancient Indian History and Culture, Calcutta University. Two of the problems discussed here relate to some aspects of Indian political history and Ancient Indian maritime commerce and the last one seeks to call in question the validity of rather too hasty and rigid application of some set sociological principles to any area of investigation.

1. *E.I.*, Vol. XX, p. 63 ; Vol. XXI, p. 81.
2. The article was received in July, 1965.—Ed.

I. The first question which engaged my attention while it was being discussed in the Seminar relates to the problem whether the Western Kṣatrapa rulers were sovereign rulers and whether they participated in commercial relations with the Westen world independently or not. So far as the first part of the question is concerned, it has been pointed out that the uniform application of the terms *Kṣatrapa* and *Mahākṣatrapa* to these rulers in their records apparently indicates their feudatory status. The evidences contrary to this conclusion, however, require careful scrutiny :

(i) It is unlikely, in the case of the existence of a suzerain power, that the Western Kṣatrapas failed to refer to it in a single record of their history extending over a period of more than four hundred years ; (ii) the Junagadh rock inscription of Rudradāman,[1] if studied critically and without any preconceived notion, leaves little doubt about the sovereign status enjoyed by the Western Kṣatrapa rulers. In the record in question, Rudradāman is described as *svayamadhigata-Mahākṣatrapa-nāman.*[2] Could this assertion of a feudatory ruler pass unchallenged by a suzerain authority ? And further, one has to consider the extent of the territory administered by Rudradāman ; could it be possible for a mere feudatory ruler to have under his independent control (as the record indicates) such a vast empire ? (iii) *The Periplus of the Erythraean Sea*, considered to be a work of the first century A.D., describes the kingdom of Nahapāna[3] and Ptolemy, the second century geographer, refers to the capital of Caṣṭana.[4] Do these references not indicate the existence of an independent kingdom under the suzerainty of the Western Kṣatrapas themselves ? (iv) It is an established historical fact that Western India was conquered by the Gupta ruler Candra-

1. D. C. Sircar, *Select Inscriptions*, pp. 169-74.
2. Junagadh inscription of Rudradāman, l. 15 (*ibid.*, p. 173).
3. *The Periplus of the Erythraean Sea*, ed. W. H. Schoff, p. 39. The point is, however, controversial.
4. McCrindle's *Ancient India as described by Ptolemy*, ed. by S. N. Majumdar Sastri, p. 152.

gupta II Vikramāditya directly from the Western Kṣatrapas. How could a conflict between the overlord of the Western Kṣatrapas and Candragupta II be avoided in case we assume the existence of any such overlord ?

Considering all these points, it appears that at least from the second century A.D. onwards the Westren Kṣatrapas enjoyed sovereign status. At the initial stage of their rule in Western India they might have been serving as the agents of the Kuṣāṇas in that direction and that explains the use of the terms *Kṣatrapa* and *Mahākṣatrapa* by the rulers of this line. But with the passage of time these two designations came to lose their true import ; an almost parallel instance is possibly offered by the case of Puṣyamitra Śuṅga who, despite his sovereign status, continued to assume the *Senāpati* title all through his life.[1]

Regarding the second part of the question, positive evidences bearing on the direct participation of the Western Kṣatrapas in Western trade are these :

(i) Barygaza, the chief centre of maritime commerce in the period under review, was included within the territory of Nahapāna.[2] (ii) There is possibly some indirect but significant reference to the commercial tussle between the Sātavāhanas and the Western Kṣatrapas in the *Periplus of the Erythraean Sea.*[3] (iii) The reference to Nahapāna in the *Periplus* may be explained by the personal presence of its writer on the West Indian coastline ; but how could we explain the reference to Caṣṭana in the *Geographike* of Ptolemy[4] or in a Central Asian text[5] if his kingdom had no commercial relations with the outside world ?

1. *History and Culture of the Indian People*, ed. R. C. Majumdar, Vol. II, p. 96.
2. *Periplus, op. cit.*, p. 39.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 43. The proper meaning of the passage in question is a subject of much controversy. In view, however, of the long-drawn struggle between the Sātavāhanas and the Western Kṣatrapas revealed through other sources, an attempt to find in this passage an indication of the tussle between the two powers originating in their commercial interests may not sound unjustifiable.
4. *Ptolemy*, p. 152.
5. Cf. Summary of the paper "Caṣṭana in a Central Asian Text" by B. N.

II. The second problem, the discussion of which by a number of scholars in the Seminar somewhat intrigued me, is : whether in ancient times gold was essential for international trade and whether the debasement of Indian gold currency from the time of Skandagupta can be interpreted in terms of the decline of foreign trade. The value of gold as a medium of exchange in international commerce cannot be underrated. It is largely true that gold is almost essential in some cases. But in less sophisticated pattern of international 'give and take' of some specific commodities, where barter is admitted, gold may at best serve as an exchangeable commodity, not a medium of exhange. And further relevant evidences indicate that for India gold was not always essential for carrying on trade with the Western world. In cases when there were no possibilities of importing commodities from outside, India could do without gold ; rather the quantity of commodities exported from India was so disproportionately high as compared to commodities imported that it resulted in the influx of Roman gold into India for a considerable period,[1] so significantly lamented over by Pliny in his *Natural History*.[2] But what is more significant is that India carried on her trade without gold, even when different commodities were imported to India. The *Periplus*,[3] Pliny's *Natural History*[4] and the *Geographike* of Ptolemy refer to different varieties of merchandise imported exclusively to South India, to the Sātavāhana and Western Kṣatrapa ports. The Western Kṣatrapas struck silver and copper coins and the major bulk of Sātavāhana coins consist of lead and potin issues. Did they pay the prices of the commodities brought to their kingdoms in

Mukherjee in the monthly notice of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, December, 1963.

1. E. H. Warmington, *The Commerce between the Roman Empire and India*, pp. 272 ff.
2. *Natural History* (The Loeb Classical Library, translated by H. Rackham), Bk. VI (XXVI), 101 ; XII, 84.
3. *Periplus*, secs. 49, 56, etc.
4. Warmington, *op. cit.*, p. 263.

gold ? Secondly, why did the Kuṣāṇas and the Guptas strike gold coins ? Was it to pay the prices of articles imported from abroad ? In that case, we have to explain why not a single Kuṣāṇa or Gupta gold coin has been discovered in countries that are supposed to have trade relations with the Kuṣāṇa or the Gupta empire. And if the prices were paid in bullion why did they strike gold coins at all ? These difficulties lead us to suggest that possibly in some cases (as in the case of the Kuṣāṇas or that of the Guptas), it is better not to link up gold currency absolutely with commercial issues ; the exclusive royal prerogative in the striking of gold coins may indicate its connection with an idea of the economic prosperity of the empire flourishing under the aegis of an absolute monarch.

In view of what has been written above, we have to explain the debasement of gold currency from the time of Skandagupta in the light of some other factors than merely in terms of the decline of trade. The chief supply of gold for Gupta gold coins seems to have been from accumulated gold.

III. The third and last question relates to an enquiry about the validity or otherwise of the 'application of some set sociological principles to any area of investigation' without taking into proper consideration all the details connected with that specific area of investigation. Supposing, for example, that our area of investigation relates to the 'growth of pressure on land in the Gupta period' (this was precisely the issue raised at the Seminar), should we not view it from different angles before we decide which particular angle of approach fits it best ?

(i) At the outset, one seeking to investigate the problem may examine the relevant records of the pre-Gupta and post-Gupta periods (along with those of the Gupta period itself) and ascertain if there was really any such growth of pressure on land. The examination of records pertaining to a limited space and time may lead to faulty conclusions.
(ii) If the result of this investigation shows that there was actually such growth of pressure on land, the next study

may be : whether the pattern of the growth of pressure on land was uniform throughout the empire. (iii) If it is found to be uniform throughout the empire, one may attempt to explain it with some general factor like a rise in the population level which itself might have been caused by the material prosperity and peace enjoyed by the unified North India in the Gupta period. If the growth of pressure on land is found to have affected a particular region alone, then it is necessary to see if it can be explained in terms of some regional or local factors affecting the social development of that locality alone. Growth of population might be there ; but here again regional growth of population cannot possibly be explained alone by the material peace and prosperity of the Gupta empire which likewise had affected at least some other parts of the empire where a rise in the population level and a consequent growth of pressure on land may be found to have been absent in the period under review. (iv) This, again, leads one to consider whether rise in the population level is inseparably connected with the growth of pressure on land. It seems that there may be growth of pressure on land even when there is no considerable rise in population level : (a) if villages instead of being self-sufficient units of production turn more and more into surplus-producing areas to their own profit. This may be determined by taking into account the percentage of population engaged in non-agricultural pursuits and the percentage of city dwellers feeding on the surplus produced by the villages ; (b) if improved techniques of cultivation were evolved to meet the demands of the non-producer and to supply raw materials to industries. This may show that an urge to produce more on land and to widen the area of cultivation (resulting in the growth of pressure on land) may be linked up with a notable rise in the percentage of city dwellers depending on agricultural surplus from the villages and with the growth of some industries depending for raw materials on agriculture and not necessarily with a rise in the population level. (iv) In this context it is also necessary to see if decline in trade could necessarily result in

any considerable growth of pressure on land in the Gupta period. If the major bulk of Indian export, commodities regularly sent abroad consisted of spices and cotton wares, a decline of trade might not necessarily result in the dependence of more people on land ; it might also have resulted in the diminution of the cultivated areas assigned for the production of spices and cotton.

ADDENDUM

(to be read after line 11 at p. 62)

As Hallam long ago pointed out, "It is easy to find partial resemblance to the feudal system. The relation of patron and client in the republic of Rome has been deemed to resemble it, as well as the barbarians and veterans who held frontier lands on the tenure of defending them and the frontier ; but they were bound not to an individual, but to the state. Such a resemblance of fiefs may be found in the Zamindars of Hindustan and the Timariots of Turkey. The clans of the Highlanders and Irish followed their chieftain into the field ; but their tie was that of imagined kindred and birth, not the spontaneous compact of vassalage."[1]

In spite of Hallam's warning, Tod, in the first half of the last century, was tempted to believe in the existence of most of the characteristics of feudalism in late medieval Rajasthan.[2] Fortunately, however, later writers on the subject have exposed Tod's "obvious anxiety to discover elements of European Feudalism in the Rajput States."[3] Sometimes even more careful writers also made similar mistakes. Thus Stein, in the latter half of the last century, explains the word *ḍāmara*, as found in Kalhaṇa's *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, as 'a feudal baron.'[4] But the *ḍāmaras* of Kashmir were rural landholders and not feudal barons in the European sense. This is quite clear from several references in the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*. It is said that king Lalitāditya (8th century A.D.) warned his successors not to leave with the cultivators of the land more than what was necessary for their bare sustenance and the cultivation of their fields, because, if they were allowed to keep more wealth, they

1. *Middle Ages*, Vol. I, p. 200.
2. *Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan*, ed. Crooke, Vol. I, pp. 153 ff.
3. Cf. A. C. Banerjee, *The Rajput States and the East India Company*, pp. 239 ff.
4. *Kalhaṇa's Rājataraṅgiṇi*, Vol. II, pp. 304 ff.

would, in a single year, become formidable *ḍāmaras* strong enough to defy the king's command (IV. 347-48). Jayyaka, the clever son of a householder of Selyapura, is stated to have succeeded in becoming a *ḍāmara* by means of accumulating the income derived from his lands and trading with foreign countries in foodgrains (VII. 494 ff.). One could therefore become a *ḍāmara* without any contact or contract with the king. On the execution of Lakkanacandra, a *ḍāmara* in possession of the fort of Dugdhaghāta and the surrounding lands, by order of king Kalaśa, the *ḍāmara's* widow offered the fort to the king apparently for protection from the inroads of the Daradas, though the king refused the offer, so that the Dugdhaghāta region, which looks like the hereditary property of the *ḍāmara*, fell into the hands of the Darada ruler (VII. 1171 ff.). Considering the above cases, it is impossible to agree with Stein's hesitant conjecture that "a kind of service tenure, the grant of land in return for military or other services, may have been the original foundation of the system."[1] It is interesting to note that, in the 16th century, the designation *ḍāmara* was applied to local grandees both Hindu and Muhammadan.[2]

The servants (both military and civil) of ancient Indian kings, besides slaves, were generally of two kinds ; viz. *maula* (those who enjoyed land, etc., hereditarily in lieu of wages) and *bhṛtaka* (those who enjoyed regular pay). The evidence of the Arab writers shows that the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king of Mānyakheṭa used to give 'regular pay to his troops', but at the same time, also had soldiers who did not recieve any wages.[3] There is however no doubt that the *maula* type of civil and military servants were entitled to serrender the land of the state and adopt any other profession of their choice. The *Rājatraṅgiṇī* speaks of an additional allowance paid to the soldiers when they were sent on an expedition (VII. 1457 ; VII, 757, 808-10).

1. *Op. cit.*, p. 307.
2. *Loc. cit.*
3 See *The Age of Imperial Kanauj*, ed. Majumdar, p. 17 ; Altekar, *The Rāṣṭrakūṭas and their Times*, pp. 250-51.

With the growth of communism, a new conception of history developed, and a socio-economic approach to historiography became popular with a section of Western historians who conceived of the existence of four successive stages through which the history of a country has to pass. These are : (1) the primitive community and the system of slavery, (2) the feudal period, (3) the capitalist period, and (4) the epoch of socialism.[1] This approach is apparently dogmatic and uncritical ; but it exercised considerable influence on some Indian historians about the middle of the present century, and we have seen, as a result, attempts to prove the existence of a feudal period in early Indian history. It is not that different writers of this category interpret the data in the same way. Often they differ widely in this respect, one finding traces of the system only in one period and another only in a second. Really, however, the views of all these writers appear to us to be based on misunderstanding and wrong interpretation of the evidence at our disposal as well as on the study only of a part of it. Like the Zamindari system of late medieval Hindustan, the early Indian land system may exhibit some superficial resemblance with European feudalism ; but none of the essential characteristics of the feudal system can be traced in India.

[The problem has also been discussed in the author's Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerji Endowment Lectures delivered at the University of Lucknow in November, 1964.]

1. Cf. *Outline History of the U.S.S.R.*, Moscow, 1960.

INDEX

A

Abhidhānacintāmaṇi 88
accu 50
Adams, G.B. 101
adhigama 34
Adhipati 47
ādhipatya 74
Adhirāja 27
adhyayana 44
adhyāpana 44
Adhināṭha 69
Ādi-parvan 107
Ādisiṁha 68
Agnimitra 99
Agrawala, V.S. 76, 84
āhāra 54
Ajayadeva 76
Ajātaśatru 98
Ajayasiṁha 65
Ajmer 68
Ajmer District 66
Akkad 25
Alberuni 90
Alhaṇa 65
Aligarh 89
Alla 71
Allahabad University 3, 41, 72
Altekar, A.S. 90, 125
Amara 57
Amara-nāyaka 57
Amarasiṁha 74
Amoda 66
Amoghavarṣa 86
Anaṅgabhīma III 70
Ananta 61
Andhra 22, 63 ,
Aṅga 65, 107
Aṅguttaranikāya 110
Anjaneri 59
anucita 93
Apabhraṁśa 90, 93
Aparājitapṛcchā 76, 84, 87-88
Arah 7, 79, 102, 125
Arang 115
Aryan 107
Arthaśāstra 72, 88, 97, 99, 114
Aryan 107
Asakawa, K. 101
Asia 100
Asia, South-East 7
asmat-svatvaka 4
Aśoka 16, 47, 98-99, 110
Āśramavāsika-parvan 108
aṣṭabhāgika 16
aṣṭa-bhoga 18
aṣṭabhoga-tejaḥsvāmya 18
Aśvamedha 107, 113-14
Avadānakalpalatā 93
Avantivarman 73
āvāta 6
āvāt-āya 17
āyudhīya 99
Ayodhyā 64, 99, 109

B

Bactrian 100, 110
Bādāmi 60
Baden Powell 77, 91
Baigram 117
Bālakāṇḍa 108-09
bali 16-17, 66
Balikṛt 29
Baluchistan 23
Bāmnerā 65
Bāṇa 47
Banaras Hindu University 3, 41

Bandyopādhyāy, Samares 41, 46
Banerjea, J. N. 100
Banerjee, A. C. 124
Banerjee, Satyaranjan 41, 50
Bangaon 63
Baniā 69
Bara Banki 113
Barkandāz 19
Barla 68
Baroda 93
Barygaza 119
Basham, A.L. 105
Basileos Basileon 100
Baner 88
Bayana 66
Bay of Bengal 7
Beatrice de Cardi 23
Becker, C. H. 101
Becker, Carl L. 96
Betava 63
Bellary 54
Bengal 90, 113
Bengal, North 8
Beni Prasad 26
Berar 65
Bethune College 3
Bharata 109
Bhaṭa 19
Bhattacharyya, Dipakchandra 3, 10
bhāga 16-17
bhāgabhogakara-hiraṇyādi-pratyāya 17
bhāgabhogakara-pratyāya 17
bhāgadheya 16
Bhāga-dugha 30
Bhagatpur 63
Bhandarkar, D. R. 98
Bhāṭerā 70
Bhavabhūti 48
Bhavnagar 71
bherī 85
Bhilsa 65
Bhīma II 70
Bhīmakheḍi 66
Bhīmapallī 74
Bhitari 115
bhoga 6, 17, 75
bhoga-bhāga 17
Bhogīna 47
Bhoja 69, 80
Bhojadeva 81
Bhoja-Paramāra 88
Bhojavarman 63
Bhojpur-Dumraon 64
Bhoktṛ 66, 75
Bhṛtaka 125
bhṛti 36
bhrūṇa-hatyā 38
bhukti 35, 67, 75
bhūmi 28
bhūmi-cchidra 6
bhūmicchidra-nyāya 13
Bhūpāla 87
bhūrja-pattalā 77-78
Bhūsvāmin 35
Bhuvaneśvar 9
Bihar 113
bīja 34
bījāvāpa 34
Bilhaṇa 62, 93
Bimbisāra 98
Birnie, A. 97
Biswas, D. 3, 41, 47
Bithu 65
Bose, Nirmal Kumar 9
Brahmacāri-kāṇḍa 74
brahmadāya 78
Brāhmaṇa 8, 44, 67, 72, 91-92 107, 114-117
Brāhmaṇa-viṁśati 19
Brahmanism 99
Bṛhaspatismṛti 77, 91
Bṛhatsaṃhitā 47
Briggs 86
brīhi 36
Britain 105
British 43
Buddha 96-98
Buddhaghoṣa 59
Buddhism 96-99
Buddhist 114

Bühler 93
Burdwan University 3, 41, 117
Buwad 73
Buzurg 86

C

Cāhamāna 63, 65-66, 75, 80-81
Cakravartin 45, 87
Calcutta 95
Calcutta University 3, 41, 117
Calmette, J.L.A. 100
Cālukya 60, 62, 81, 85-87
Cambay 60
Cambridge 24
Cāṇakya 33
Candella 62-63, 74, 81, 93-94
Caṇdeśvara-miśra 84
Candragupta 12, 110
Candragupta I 111
Candragupta II 112, 118-19
Carlyle, R.W. 101
Caṣṭana 118-19
Cāṭa 19
Caturaṁśika 84
Caturāśika 76
Caturaśitimānyaka-paṭṭa 76
Cāturvarṇya 94
Caulukya 70-71
Caurāsiyā 77
Chakravarti, N. P. 67
Chammak, 115
Charkhari 81
Charles Martel 79
Chātra 19
Chatterjee, B. D. 3, 6, 117
Chatterjee, H. N. 3-4, 41, 47
Chattisgarh 77
Cheymur 56
Chicacole 68
Chikati 66
Childe 23-24, 26
China 60, 103
Chaudhuri, S. B. 3-6, 41
Choudhary, R. K. 74, 83
Chou dynasty 103
Cintra Praśasti 71
Citralekhā 66
Coḍa 63
Cola 56, 60, 110
colonus 105
Comilla 7
Crooke 124
crown-land 4
Cuttack 70
cūrṇī 59

D

Dāhala 66
Daibal 56
dakṣiṇā 114
Dalal, C. D. 77
Dāmara 81, 90, 124-25
Dāmodara 92
Dāmodarpur 8
daṇḍ-ādāna 36
Dantapura 68
Dāpaka 14
Darada 125
Daśaratha 108
Das Gupta, T. C. 90, 92
Dasyu 106
Davis, W. S. 101
dāya 34
dāyabhāk 37
Deccan 61, 111
Delhi 112
Delhi-Siwalik 63
Deopara 69
deśa-bhāṣā 82
Deśapati 74
Deśināmamālā 82
devadāya 78
Devapāla 63
Devavarmadeva 81
Devānāmpriya-priyadarśī Aśoka 110
Devapālaśarman 65
deya 17
Dey, B. 41, 46
Dhanop 65

dhanajutta-dharā 90
dhānya-hiraṇya 17
dhānya-saḍbhāga 11
dharaṇa 59
Dharmakheḍi 66
Dharmaśāstra 44, 90, 94
dharma-vijaya 110
Dhṛtarāṣṭra 108
Dhruvādhikaraṇika 16
Dhruvasthānika 6
dhruva-vṛtti 73
Digvijayin 108
dināra 48, 59
dinnāra 48, 59
Dommaṇapāla 64
Dowson 89
dramma 48, 56, 59, 71
Droṇasiṁha 113
Dudhpani 64
Dugdhaghāta 125
Duḥsādhya 75
Duryodhana 107
Dutch 43
Dvivedi, Hajari Prasad 74
Dvyāśraya 85

E

Egypt 25, 103
Ekarāṭ 27, 45, 108
Elliot 89
England 79, 83
Eran 5
Eṛapa-nāyaka 68
Europe 83, 89, 100, 103, 105

F

Faridpur 7
feud 42
feudal 42
feudalis 42
Feudalism 42, 101
feudum 101
Fleet, 111-12
Forbes, A. K. 73
France 79, 89
Franke, O. 103
French 43

G

Gadādhara 62
gadyāṇa 59
Gaṅga 19, 64, 66, 68, 70
Ganjam 64, 66
Gauḍa 62-63, 90
Gauhati University 3, 41
Gaul 105
Gaulmika 54
Gautama 33-34
Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi 114
Gaya 64, 113, 115
Gāhaḍavāla 65, 67, 74, 80, 86, 93
gāmaroda 82
Geographike 119-120
German 43
Ghaṁghāṇakapadra 66
ghāṇaka 69
Ghosal, U. N. 72, 99
ghoṭaka 78
Ghaṭotkaca 111
Gibbon, Edward 96
girā 67, 75
Gopal, Lallanji 3, 5-6, 41-42, 103
Gordon Childe 96
Govindacandra 74, 80, 86
Govindakeśava 70
Govindapur 64
grāma-kāma 30
Grāmaṇī 82
grāmapaṭṭa 74
Grāmarakṣaka 35
Grāmika 82
grāsa 67, 75
grāsa-lopana 78
Greece 26
Greek 100
Griffith 28
Guhila 75, 80
Gujarat 60, 70, 74-75, 80, 82, 85, 90
Gunaighar 115

Guntur 60
Gupta 4, 87, 111-13, 115, 117-18, 121-23
Gupta, Mata Prasad 77
Gurjara-Pratihāra 66, 75-76
Gwalior 66, 70-71, 81, 87.

H

hala 34, 67
Hallam 124
Harappa 24
Hari 69
Harirāja 66
Hariścandra 67
Hariṣeṇa 73
Harmondsworth 24
Harṣacarita 46-47, 50, 73
Hastikuṇḍi 65
Hastin 113, 115
Hazaribagh 64, 68
Hemacandra 82, 86, 88
Hindu 125
Hindustan 124, 126
Hiraṇya 11
Hiuen-tsang 72
holākādhikaraṇa 37
Hūṇa 63, 110.

I

Ikṣvāku 109
India 83, 100, 105
India, Central 8
Indian Museum 6
India, Southern 8
Indochina 60
Indo-Greek 110
Indonesia 60
Indo-Parthian 55
Indra 106-07
Indradhavala 64
Indus Civilization 24-25
Iran 23
irrigation tax 5
Īśa 47
Italy 105

J

Jābālipur 80
Jadavpur University 3, 41, 100
Jagaddeva 74
Jagamalla 71
Jāgū 4, 47, 59, 66, 99
Jaimini 11, 34-35, 37
Jaina-Bhagavatīsūtra 110
Jain Saṁgha 114
Jaipur State 66
Jamīndār 34
Jarāsandha 107
Jātaka No. 46, 109
Jāṭaśarman 65
Jaunpur 113
Jayaccandra 67
Jayaghaṇṭā 85
Jayamaṅgalā 33
Jayanagara-grāma 70
Jayanātha 115
Jayantīpura 66
Jayapālaśarman 65
Jayāpīḍa 61
Jayasiṁha 61
Jayasiṁha Siddharāja 90
Jayaswal, K. P. 88
Jayatasīha 67
Jayatasiṁha 65
Jayyaka 90, 125
Jesus Christ 96
Jīmūtavāhana 67
Jinasenācārya 91
Jodhpur 65, 80
Junāgaḍh 118

K

Kacchapaghāta 66
Kādambarī 47
Kadamba 60
Kaivarta 80
kaivartta-vṛtti 74, 80

kākanikā 59
Kalacuri 59, 63, 66, 80, 86
kaḷañju 59
Kalaśa 125
Kalhaṇa 12, 124
Kālidāsa 37, 48
Kaliṅga 64
Kaliṅganagara 66, 68
Kaliṅgarāja 66
Kalpasūtrādhikaraṇa 37
Kāmasūtra 33
Kāmasūtraṭīkā 33
Kamauli 74
Kaṁsyakāra-Śreṣṭhī 68
Kanauj 65
kaṇṭakoddharaṇa 36
Kāṇva 110
Kara 16, 34
Karaṇa-kāyastha 63
kara-pratyāya 17
karādāna 36
Karitalai 115
Kārkoṭa 12
Karl Marx 96
Karṇa 81, 85-87, 107-08
Karṇāṭa 63-65
Karṇāṭaka 64
Karṇāṭī 64
Karṣaka 34, 90
karṣaṇa 34
kārṣāpaṇa 59
Kashmir 81-83, 90, 124
kaṭaka 78
Kathākoṣa 73
Kathāsaritsāgara 73, 92
Kaṭukarāja 65
Kaurava 107-108
Kauśāmbī 99
Kauṭilya 4
Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra 11-12
Kelhaṇa 65-66, 80
Keralaputra 110
Keṭṭapāla 81
Khajuraho 63
Khaṇḍimalla 68
Khaśa 63
Kheḍi 66
Khoh 115-16
Kile Gul Mohammed 23
kīnāśa 91
Kīrtipāla 65, 80
Kiṣkindhā 109
Kiṣkindhā-kāṇḍa 109
kḷpta 115
Kokkalla 66
koṇḍio 82
Koreṭā 65
koṣadaṇḍa 6
Kośala 109, 111
Koṣṭhāgārika 6
Koṭṭapāla 71
Kötzschke, Rudolf 104
kraya 34
kraya-śāsana 8
kṛṣībala 91, 94
Kṛṣṇarāja 59
Kṛṣṇā-Godāvarī valley 111
Kṛtyakalpataru 74
Kṣaḥrapa 118-20
kṣema 35, 38
Kṣemendra 81, 93
Kṣetrapati 90
Kṣetra-sā 31
Kṣetrasvāmī 90-91
Kṣetrasya patiḥ 31
Kṣatriya 44
Kṣatriyavarga 88
Kṣetrika 90
Kudopali 86
kula 47
Kulika 63
kulyavāpa 6
Kumāragupta 7
Kumāragupta I 112
Kumārapāla 74, 80, 86-87
Kumārapālacarita 73, 86
Kuṁvarasiṁha 65
Kurukṣetra 108
Kuṣāna 7, 48, 111, 119, 121
kuṭumba-kṣetra 90
Kuṭumbika 90
Kuṭumbī, Kuṭumbin 81, 90

L

Laghusāmanta 84, 87
Lakhaṇapāla 65
Lakkanacandra 125
Lakṣmaṇa 68
Lakṣmīdhara 62, 74, 77, 91, 94
Lalitāditya 62, 124
Lāmā Tāranātha 93
landed aristocracy 42
landed economy 100
landlord 20
landlordism 42
land-sale records 9
land system 3-4, 77
Laṭakamelaka 74, 84, 93
Lāṭa 63
latifunda 104
Latin 42
Leiden 26, 103
lekha 35
Lekhapaddhati 77
lekhya 35
Lipsāsūtra 34
Lipson, E. 83, 94, 96
London 100, 102, 105
Loralai 23
Lothal 24
Lucknow University 3, 41, 126

M

Machhlishahr 67
māḍa 59
Madana 62
Madanapāla 63
Madanū 65
Mādhavasena 99
Madhukāmārṇava 68
Madhya Pradesh 62, 65
Magadha 68, 110-11
Mahaṇa 65
Mahābhārata 107-08
Mahābhavagupta 86
Mahādevī 67
mahājana 71
Mahāmātya 81
Mahā-Jayarāja
Mahākṣatrapa 118-119
Mahāmaṇḍaleśvara 84
Mahāmāṇḍalika 64, 67
Mahāmātya 88
Mahāpurāṇa 91
Mahārāja 45, 111-13, 115
Mahārājaputra 65
Mahārājādhirāja 65, 86, 112, 115
Mahārājñī 67
Mahāsādhanika 73
Mahāsāmanta 45, 84, 87, 110, 112-13
Mahā-senāpati 54
Mahā-Sudevarāja 115
Mahāvastu 110
Mahāyāna 115
Mahendrapāla II 73
Mahīpāla II 66
Maināmatī 92
Maiti, S.K. 3, 6, 41, 72, 100
Maitland, E.G. 79
Maitraka 17, 112
Majhgawam 115
Majumdar, B.P. 84
Majumdar, R.C. 64, 111, 119
Majumdar Sastri, S.N. 118
Mālava 63
Mālavikāgnimitra 99
Malaysia 60
Malwa 61, 112-13
Māna 64
Manahali 4, 63
Mānapura 65
Mānasollāsa 75
Maṇḍalapati 66
Maṇḍalādhipati 87
Maṇḍaleśa 87
Maṇḍaleśvara 85
Māṇḍalika 34-35, 84, 87
Maṇḍalika-rājā 98
Maṅgalarāja 66

Māṇikcandra 92
manor 93-94, 100, 103-04
Mantri-pariṣad 99
Manu 11, 15, 47, 97
Manusaṁhitā, Manusmṛti 47, 83
Manu Vaivasvata 15
Mānyakheṭa 125
Manyon, L.A. 100
Marc Bloch 49, 79, 83, 100, 102
Marwar 75
Marxist 101
Mathanadeva 65, 75
Mathurā 99
Māthurānvaya 63
Maukhari 113
maula 125
Maurya 99-100, 110
Mazumdar, B. P. 3-4, 6, 41-42
McCrindle 118
Medhātithi 82-83, 90-91, 94
Megasthenes 12, 15
Mesopotamia 25-26
meya 17
Mīmāṃsā 37
Mirashi, V.V. 90
Mitākṣarā 9, 91
mitra 99
Mitra, R.L. 81
Mitra, S.K. 3-4, 41-42, 45, 47
Moharājaparājaya 90
Mohenjodaro 24
Monghyr 63
Montesquieu 101
Mookerjee, Radhakumud 126
mortgage 8
mṛtyuka-vṛtti 19
Mughul empire 112
Muhammadan 125
Mukherjee, B.N. 119-20
Mukherjee, D. 3-4, 41-42, 45, 47
Mukherji, Radhakamal 91
Mukhopadhyay, Mihirmohan 3, 10
Murthy, H.V.S. 3, 6, 41
Muslim invasion 105
Myakadoni 54

N

Naḍḍūla 65-66, 80
Naḍḍūlāī 65
Naḍḍūla-maṇḍala 87
Nāḍlāi 69
Nāḍol 63
Nāgapāla 78
Nag, Dilip Kumar 41, 50
Nahapāna 118-19
Nahata, Agara Candra 77
Naiṣadha 88
Nālandā 115
Nalavitāsa-nāṭaka 90
Nāmaliṅgāmuśāsana 88
Nānyadeva 63
Nāpita 35
Nārada 91
Naravarman 67
Nārāyaṇa 66
Narendradhavala 8
Narmamālā 93
Nasik 4
Nasik-Poona region 18
Nāthaśarman 6
Natural History 120
Navasāri 85
Nāyanikā 114
Neogi, H.C. 41, 46, 95
New York 101
niṣka 59
nivartana 114
niyat-āniyat-ādeya 93
Niyogi, R. 3
nyāya 37

O

Orissa 8, 63, 65, 68, 70, 86
Ormuz 60
Ottoman 79

P

padāti-jana 78
Paharpur 117

Pāik 19, 23
Pākistān, East 7
Pāla 15, 60, 63, 69
Pālhuka 68
Pāli 65
palikā 69-70
Pamahai 67
paṇa 19
pañcamahāśabda 68, 84-85
Pañcaviṣayādhipati 66
Pañcāla 99
Pāṇḍava 108
Pāṇḍya 110
pannasa 19
paṇya-daśabhāga 11
Pārada 45
Paradeśī 49
Paramardin 74
Paramāra 14, 62-63, 67, 69, 73, 76, 80
Pares, B. 102
Paris 100
Parivrājaka 113
Parthian 55, 110
pāṭaka 115
Pāṭaliputra 112
Pathari 65
Patna University 3, 41
Paṭṭadhara 73
Paul, Vinogradoff 93
Periclean age 100
parigraha 34
Periplus 120
Persian 100
Peterson 76, 87-88
Petluripalem 60
Pharaoh 25
Piggott, Stuart 24-25
Pliny 120
Postan, M.M. 100
Powell, Baden 77, 91
Prabandhacintāmaṇi 47, 74, 86
Prabhākara 69
Prabhākaravardhana 73
Praharājaśarman 65
Prākṛtapaiṅgala 90
praṇayakriyā 16
prasāda-likhita 77
prasāda-paṭṭalā 77-78
Praśāsaka 34-35
praśasti 62
Prasenajit 98
Pratāpadevī 66
Pratāpadhavala 64
Pratīhāra 73
pratyāya 18
Pravarasena II 115
Presidency College 3, 41
Pṛthvīrāja III 68, 86
Ptolemy 68, 118-20
Pūnapākṣadeva 76, 87-88
Purāṇa 59
Pūrṇacandra 64
Purohita 35
Purushottampuri 18
Puruṣottama 70
Pūrvakhāṭikā 64
Puṣkara 18
Puṣkara-tīrtha 18
Puṣyamitra Śuṅga 99, 112, 119
puṭṭi 22

Q

Quetta 23

R

Rāhīhīyaka 67
Raipur 115
Rājā 73, 87, 92, 98
Rājadeva 67
Rājaguru, S.N. 68
rājaka 35
rājakaṁ kṣetram 4
rājakīya-bhoga 76
Rājan 45, 106-07
Rājanītiratnākara 84, 88
Rājanya 106
Rājapāla 69, 81
rājapaṭṭi 74, 80
Rājaputa 87

Rājaputra 76, 78, 82, 84, 87
rāja-sambhoga 4
Rajasthan 76, 124
Rājasūya 106
Rājatarangiṇī 48, 59, 61, 73, 81, 85, 124-25
Rajjuka 98
Rājñī 67
Rajput 64, 77, 105, 124
Rajputana 75, 77
Rajshahi 7
Rājyadharavarman 65
rakṣapālatva 78
rakta-mānya 19
Rāma 109
Rāmacandra 107
Rāmacandra-sūri 90
Rāmacarita 74, 87
Rāmadeva 68
Rāmapāla 74
Rāmāyaṇa 108
Rāmeśvaram 9
Rāmpāl 64
Rāṇaka 66, 69, 78, 82
rāṣṭra (state) 5
Rāṣṭrakūṭa 60, 65, 125
Ratnamālā 73
Ratnapur 76, 87-88
Ratnin 30
Rauch, G.V. 102
Rāuta 65
Rāutta-rāja 74
Rāvāṇa 109
Raychaudhuri, H.C. 56, 98
Ray, H.C. 66, 74
Ray, N.R. 3, 5, 41, 100
Ṛgveda 11
Rhine 105
Richard II 43
riktha 34, 36
rikthakraya 36
Rohitāgiri 64
Rohtasgarh 64
Roman 7
Rome 4, 124
Rousseau 96
Rowland 100
royal land 5
royal ownership 9
Rudradatta 115
Rudradāman I 16, 59, 118
rūpaka 48, 59, 71
Russia 42, 96, 102
Russian 43, 101

S

sabhā 108
Sabhā-parvan 107
Sachau 90
Saciva 112
Sahasrabhaṭa 73
Sāmanta 47, 53-54, 56, 68, 73-74, 84-87, 92, 113
Sāmantacakra-cūḍāmaṇi 87
Sāmanta-cūḍāmaṇi 113
Sāmantasena 63
Samasta-rājāvalī-virājita 87
Samastarājocchettā 87
Samayamātṛkā 81
Sambhar 75
Sambhoga 5, 6
saṅgha 115
samīkaraṇa 34
Saṁnaṁdarī 67
Samrāṭ 27, 88, 106-08
Samudragupta 5, 115, 120-21
Samudrasena 113
saṁvibhāga 34
Sanchi 112
Sāndhivigrahika 88
Saṇḍeraka 66
Sandhyākara-nandin 87
saṅgha 98
Saṅgrāmavisara 74
Sanjan 86
sannipāta 86
Sanskrit 93
Sanskrit College 3, 41, 95
Saraswati, S.K. 3-4, 41, 44-45
Sarkar, S. 41
sārthavāha 37

Sārvabhauma 27
Sāsbahū 66
Ṣaṣṭhādhikṛta 15
Śātakarṇi I 114
Sātavāhana 54, 100, 111, 119-20
Satrap 100
Satyaputra 110
Saurāṣṭra 71
Schoff, W.H. 118
Scythian 45, 55
Selluka 69
Selyapura 125
Semra 18
Sena 69, 90
Senāpati 99, 119
Sen, B. 82
servus casatus 105
Shahabad 64
Shakespeare 43,
Shamasastry 88
Shang dynasty 103
Sharma, D. 89
Sharma R.S. 3-4, 6, 41, 72, 83, 90-91, 116
Sidgwick, H. 80
Siṁhapura 63-64
Singh, S. D. 3, 5, 26, 41, 48
Singh Yadava, B.N. 41
Sircar, D.C. 3-4, 41-45, 47-48, 63, 68, 87, 114, 118
Śiśupālavadha 85
Siwani 115
Siyadoni 56
Śiravāhaka 91, 94
Skandagupta 7, 112, 115, 121
Smṛti 4-5, 72
Soḍhadeva 66
Soḍḍhala 73, 79
Solaṅkī 73
soḷasa-mahājanapada 110
Somasvāmin 114
Someśvara 75
Somanath 48
Sonapāla 65
Sonānā 65
Sone 64
Spain 105
Spellman 30
Sprott 72
state land 4
state ownership 9
Stein 124-25
Struve, P. 52
Sugrīva 109
sui generis 101
Sukri valley 80
Sukṛtasaṅkīrtana 74
Sulṭān 79
Sunak 81
Sundarban 64, 85
Śuṅga 99-100
suvarṇa 59
Suvarṇa-baṇik 90
Suvarṇadvīpa 7
Sūktimuktāvalī 93
Śūlapāṇi 69
Sūri 90
sva-bhoga 5-6, 81
sva-bhujyamāna 81
svabhoga-nagara 5
svabhog-āvāpta 75
Svadeśi 49
svapitṛsvatvaka 6
Svayambhū 68
svayaṁvara 108
Svāmin 5
Sylhet District 6
Syria 110
Śabara 11
Sabarsvāmin 35
Śailendra 60
Śaiva 71
Śaka 18, 60, 110-12
Śaka era 60
Śamīpati 65
Śaṅkara 48
Śaṅkha 85
Śaṅkhadhara 74
Śarabhapura 17
Śaśāṅka 6
Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 106
Śāhānuśāhi 45

Śāhi 45
Śakuntalā 37
Śānti 108
Śeṭh 69
Śiva 71
Śrāvasti 8
Śreṣṭhī 69, 71
Śrīcandra 64
Śrī-Jāṭa 80
Śṛṅga 85
śulka 16
śulka-bhāgabhogakarahiraṇyādi-pratyāya 17
Śūdra 91, 94
Śukranīti 82
Śuṅga 99-100, 110
Śvetaka 88

T

Talājha 71
Talavargika 73
Taluk 66
ṭamaṭa 85
Tanner, E.M. 98
Tantoṭi 66
Tarain 86
Tarikh-i-Firishta 86
Tawney, R.H. 86, 96
Tāmralipti 64
Tāmraparṇī 110
Ṭhakkura 65, 67-68, 84, 87
Ṭiguḷa 22
Tihuṇaka 67
Timariat 124
Timbāṇaka 71
Tod 121
Tokyo 101
Trasadasyu 27
tribhog-ābhyantara-siddhi 19
Tripathi, A. 41
Triraśmi hill 114
trivarga 33
Tulunid 103
tulyameya 17
Tuṁmāna 66
Turkey 124
Turki Sultanate 112
Turuṣka 22

U

Uccakalpa 17
Ucchakalpīya 113
ucika 93
Udaipur 65
Udayagiri 112
Udayakheḍi 66
Udayamāna 64
Udayarāja 64
Udayasundarikathā 73, 79, 93
udbalika 16
Ugrakheḍi 66
Ujjainiyā 64
Uktivyaktiprakaraṇa 92
umbaḷam 16
umbaḷika 16
umbaḷikkai 16
upakḷpta 115
U. P. (Uttar Pradesh) 8
Uravarā-jit 31
Urvarā-sā 31
Uttar Pradesh 62

V

vadhū 67
Vaillabhaṭṭasvāmin 70-71
Vainyagupta 115
Vaiśya 44, 90
Vaiśy-āgrahāra 19, 68
Vajravarman 63
Valabhī 112
Vaṇikputra 69
Varāha 59
Varāhamihira 47
Varman 63
varṇāśrama 44
Varuṇa 27
Vassakāra 98
Vastupālacarita 82, 89, 93
Vatsarāja 74

Vāghela 70
Vājapeya 106
Vākāṭaka 15, 44
Vākpati II 80
Vālabhya 63
Vālahī 67
Vālin 109
Vāraka-maṇḍala 114
Vārendra 69
Vasiṣṭha 65
Vāsudevasvāmin 114
vāṭaka 6
Vātsyāyana 33
Veraval 60
Victoria Memorial 3, 41
Vidiśā 99
Vigrahapāla III 63
Vigraharāja Cāhamāna 89
Vigraharājadeva 77
Vijayanagara 19, 57
Vijayasena 69
Vidyaneswara 36
Vikramāditya 119
Vikramāditya VI 62
Vikramāṅkadevacarita 93
Villa 104
Vinogradoff, P. 101
vintner 61
viṣaya 80, 86
viṣṭi 16, 93
Vīrasena-Śāba 112
Vīsaladeva Rāso 77
Vivādaratnākara 91
Vajji 98
Voltaire 101
vṛtti 36
vyāṣedha 78
Vyavahārakāṇḍa 77, 91, 94
Vyavahāramayūkha 11

W

Warmington, E. H. 120
Warner, G. T. 98
Watten 73
West Pakistan 23
Wheeler 24, 25
Wills, C. W. 77
Wu Wang 103

Y

Yādava 15, 64
Vādava, B. N. S. 3, 72, 75, 84-85, 89,
yajana 44
yājana 44
Yajñasena 99
Yaśodharman 113
Yaśovarman 69
Yudhiṣṭhira 107
Yuvarāja 109

Z

Zamindar 117, 124
Zamindari 126
Zhob 23

ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA

Page 7, line 36	*Read*—exchange for
„ 9, line 7	*Read*—opinion
„ 9, line 12	*Read*—Rāmeśvaram
„ 32, line 4	*Add*—Calcutta University
„ 36, line 5	Read—*svatv-otpādaka*
„ 37, line 6	Read—*samāna-prāmāṇya*
„ 41, line 32 and „ 48, line 34	*Read*—Sri Samares Banerjee. *For*—Dr. S. Banerjee
„ 67, lines 27-28	*Read*—Jīmūtavāhana
„ 68, line 27	*Read*—engraver
„ 69, line 31	*Read*—Nāḍlāi
„ 70, line 5	*Read*—number of agricultural
„ 74, lines 11 ff., and „ 80, lines 25ff.	*Add Editorial Note*—The interpretation of *Kaivarta-vṛtti* as an assignment to the fishermen for military service is one of the unjustifiable assumptions, since *Kaivarta-bhoga* and *Kaivarta-vṛtti* appear to refer to land that the fishermen enjoyed, like the preists, barbers, washermen, etc., for their service including ferrying, supply of fish and boats, etc.
„ 74, line 24	Read—*Kṛtyakalpataru*
„ 77, line 16	Read—*Vyavahārakāṇḍa*
„ 85, foot-note 1, line 3	Read—*jayaghaṇṭā*
„ 87, line 2	*Add Editorial Note*—Read—*sarva-rāj-occhettā*, For — *samasta-rāj-occhettā*.
„ „ line 30	Read—*Rājaputas*
„ 95, line 7	*Read*—handicapped
„ 121, lines 4ff.	*Add Editorial Note*—It is well known that Kuṣāṇa coins were discovered in Wales and Scandinavia, and recently a hoard of them has been found in Abyssinia. See *JRAS*, 1912, p. 672; *Convegno Internazionale di Studi Etiopici*, Academia Nazionale di Lincei, Rome, 1959, pp. 249ff.

4-7-66